THE EXPOSITORY TIMES.

Notes of Recent Exposition.

From the Principal of New College, London, the Rev. Sydney Cave, D.D., comes a volume—*The Christian Way*[1]—worthy of the tradition of his office, and representative of the Evangelical Liberal outlook in theology at which in some quarters to-day it is a foolish fashion to sneer. His interest, as the title indicates, is in the ethical bearing of Christianity. But like Herrmann fifty years ago, who prefaced his disquisition on Christian ethics by a study of the origin of the Christian life in the New Birth and Conversion, Dr. Cave resolutely maintains that for a Christian all ethical considerations rest on the great evangelical doctrinal affirmations of the faith. His book thus involves a presentation of the whole Christian message. 'The Christian gospel is good news of God,' 'Its first concern is not what man must do but what God has done . . . Christian Ethics is derivative.' 'The contribution of Christianity to the problems of personal character and corporate activity does not lie merely or even chiefly in the teaching of Jesus. It lies in the significance of God's action for men in Jesus Christ.'

This contention is reinforced by the modern recognition of the impossibility of forcing a contrast between the simple charm of Jesus' teaching and the difficulty of theology. There is no longer unanimous admiration for His teaching. The complaint is common that it is too soft for the crude facts or too lofty for practical use. Jesus as teacher is as much criticised as Paul the theologian. This should not be disconcerting. It just reflects the truth that it is futile to consider the teaching apart from the whole message of salvation.

Dr. Cave accordingly notes the theological doctrine that underlies the ethical teaching of the New Testament. Behind all the words of Jesus is His rejection of legalism in man's relation to God and to his fellows. Jesus gives no code to solve modern problems, only His example and His Spirit. The early Christian Communism was of love among consumers with no reference to problems of production. For Paul the experience of conversion meant a radically different approach to ethics; obedience became response to the experience of God's grace, and it is on this basis that his comments on the details of conduct proceed. The New Testament in fact knows nothing of a simple teaching of Jesus which has only to be systematized to provide the solution of every problem and a compilation of Christian ethics. Its moral teaching is all dependent on the story of the redemptive action of God.

This leads to a discussion of the question whether there are ethical principles universally valid to be found in what is called Natural Law. This section has evidently been written before the appearance of Professor Henderson's 'Can Two Walk Together.' Dr. Cave points out that the Natural Law referred to in Paul and in Roman Catholic and Calvinist theology has as its ground the dogma of Divine creation, and is thus a quite different notion from a Natural Law rooted in human reason or science. He would agree with Professor Henderson that without a common acceptance of that dogma there can be no world-wide agreement on a universal Natural Law and no basis for world justice and peace.

Dr. Cave then proceeds to a consideration of sex relations and marriage; of the religious aspect of economic problems; of what he calls 'the enigma of the State' and of the task of the Church, which is in the first instance the proclamation of the gospel rather than the formulation of an ethical demand. All problems will look different to those who have experienced God's forgiveness, and it is the task of common members of the Church to bring this Christian insight to bear on the discussions and struggles of his age. These pages are grave and wise rather than exciting. He quotes approvingly the statement in a joint pamphlet by a bishop and a magistrate and a doctor that 'deliberate prevention of conception is necessary in the normal marriage,' but leaves the reader to gather for himself the conclusion that there is no proper Christian ban on modern

[1] Nisbet; 16s. net.

methods. Treating of divorce he urges that failure in marriage should not be the one failure for which the penitent cannot be forgiven. Here one feels that a teethy comment might have been made on the contention of some that loyalty to a literal interpretation of aphorisms of Jesus demands that full Divine forgiveness and restoration be accompanied by ecclesiastical regulations which rub salt into old wounds.

One might wish a more definite description of the difference in structure between a Totalitarian and a Federal constitution of the State. And Dr. CAVE's sorrowful admission of the ethical mistakes of the Church in the past has not the incisiveness of Mr. Guy Kendall's recent demonstration of the contradiction and uncertainty and inconsistency and hesitation in regard to social ethics which is as bewildering to-day as ever. But again and again the reader will note memorable and felicitously phrased pronouncements. For Jesus the Kingdom meant 'not a realm but a rule,' and fatherhood was 'as an Oriental understood it, not only of love but of authority.' When Dr. CAVE says, 'Moral values are not derived from Natural Science,' he is in accord with Bertrand Russell who has just written in the *British Medical Journal* that the question of values lies outside scientific discussion. Remarking that the word 'grace' reminds us of the Greek ideal of beauty he says, 'there was one kind of moral beauty which the Greeks prized and described as grace —the beauty of ungrudging generosity.' And this is well put, 'a religion which speaks first of demand drives the earnest few to despair and leads the insensitive many to complacency.'

Miss Georgia HARKNESS, who is a minister of the Methodist Church and Professor of Applied Theology in Garrett Biblical Institute at Evanston, Illinois, is the author of many devotional and doctrinal works. Her most recent work is a study of contemporary Christianity in which she discusses such subjects as the present state of the churches, what the churches have to say to the modern mind, what are the dominant types of church life, and what are the functions of the minister in interpreting and communicating the Christian faith and of the layman in bridging the gulf between what is preached to him in church on Sunday and his interests and activities through the week. The book is entitled, *The Gospel and Our World*.[1]

Miss HARKNESS writes in a clear and popular style from a liberal Protestant standpoint, with the churches of America in view almost entirely throughout her book. Her thesis is that 'the churches of America, though far from decadent, are doing much less effective work than they might be doing with their resources, and that the major cause of the difficulty lies in failure to present the meaning and claims of the Christian faith in terms that seem vital to the common man. In short, there is need of a much closer connexion than we have had thus far between theology and evangelism.'

The concluding discussion endeavours to support this thesis with reference to the relation between theology and 'the social gospel,' and more especially between theology and Christian ethical decision. For errors or inadequacies in theology may inhibit fruitful social action. The author considers here three doctrines of the Christian faith—creation, judgment, and redemption (and with redemption the closely related concept of the Kingdom of God). Let us give in summary her treatment of the second-named doctrine, that of judgment.

She begins by remarking that in the modern world we may find easy corroboration of the truth of Divine judgment, or in other words, of the existence of a moral order in the universe. In many a recent sermon the tragic events of the past generation have been cited as directly traceable to human sin—'particularly in the forms of acquisitiveness, national pride and arrogance, vindictiveness, cruelty, narrowness of outlook, and collective selfishness.' But it is rightly added that this is not to present the full Christian doctrine of Divine judgment: it makes judgment too impersonal, as being involved in an automatically working moral order.

When conservative theology seeks to complete the picture of the idea of Divine judgment it usually has recourse to the personal conception of a God of wrath. It catches up the message of doom which resounds through the words of the prophets, and which is to be found in the teaching of Jesus. But while numerous references to the Divine wrath occur in both Testaments, it may still be questioned whether the prophetic message of doom is God's last word, whether indeed the promise and the coming of the Saviour of the world must not be viewed as the positive side of the word of judgment. Liberalism may have made judgment too impersonal; but the orthodoxies, old and new, have made it 'too wrathful.' In the centre of judgment is a loving God who seeks to win men to obedience. God is righteously

[1] Abingdon-Cokesbury Press; $1.50.

angry at man's sin ; He is not angry at sinners, in any vindictive sense of the phrase.

There is danger in the stress laid by conservative doctrine on the wrath of God. 'The moment the door is opened to a view of judgment which makes God wrathful in the sense of vindictive toward any of his sinful human children, at that moment we begin to find alibis for our own vindictive passions.' And this statement the author would support by saying that there are those who view our bombs, battleships, and bacteriological laboratories, not simply as instruments of security, but as instruments for the infliction of Divine judgment upon the unrighteous.

Miss HARKNESS concludes by referring to another error commonly made about the doctrine of Divine judgment. It appears in the inability to answer the question, 'Why do the righteous suffer while sinners prosper?' A correspondence between righteousness and prosperity may be seen in national life, but it should be realized that it does not seem to have its counterpart in individual experience. It is clear that in the Divine intention goodness gives no immunity from pain. And as we cannot point any longer to deferred penalties for sin, no more can we to deferred rewards for righteousness. 'This may mark some progress from the day when the fear of hell was a dominant motive to Christian ethical action. But if nothing is put in its place, what we have is not gain but loss.' However, the author sees no way out except through a better understanding of both judgment and redemption. So she proceeds to consider what redemption means in the context of our society.

The Life of Christ in the Twentieth Century.

BY PROFESSOR A. M. HUNTER, PH.D., D.PHIL., THE UNIVERSITY, ABERDEEN.

'SIR,' said the Greeks to Philip, 'we want to see Jesus.' It is a request that echoes down the centuries. No life has ever fascinated men like that of Jesus, none has produced more books. Who shall number the 'Lives' of Christ that appeared in the nineteenth century? And still, in this twentieth century, now half run, the century of the two greatest wars in history when more and more men seem preoccupied with science and the production of lethal weapons, the fascination of the Story of Jesus continues, and men, learned and unlearned, study anew those frail and fragmentary records of Jesus and his words which we call the Four Gospels, in hope of learning more or of surprising some secret not yet disclosed to previous students of the records.

It is the purpose of this article to pick out the ten most important contributions to the Story of Jesus in the twentieth century. Not all of them are 'Lives' in the strict sense. Inevitably, we shall omit some that others will consider better worthy of inclusion ; but all of them add something to our knowledge or see Jesus from an angle that is new. And any one who likes can add to our selected ten.

The ten we choose, in chronological order, are :

William Sanday, *Outlines of the Life of Christ* (1905).
James Denney, *Jesus and the Gospel* (1908).
Albert Schweitzer, *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* (1910).
T. R. Glover, *The Jesus of History* (1917).
Joseph Klausner, *Jesus of Nazareth* (1925).
Rudolf Bultmann, *Jesus* (1925) ; Eng. tr., *Jesus and the Word* (1934).
Middleton Murry, *Life of Jesus* (1926).
T. W. Manson, *The Teaching of Jesus* (1931).
Maurice Goguel, *The Life of Jesus* (1933 ; French, 1932).
Rudolf Otto, *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man* (German, 1934 ; Eng. tr., 1938).

I.

Our first book is, of course, a reprint of the famous article which Dr. William Sanday of Oxford contributed to the second volume of Hastings' *Dictionary of the Bible* in 1899. In some ways, it is the classical treatment of our theme in English. The 'lay-out' of the material could hardly be bettered, and the tone of the whole is eminently wise. What sort of man is needed to write the Life of Christ? Sanday answered : 'A Newman with science and adequate knowledge.' No man of his time came nearer that ideal than Sanday himself. Wide learning, exact scholarship, a luminous style—all were his. He had, moreover, that rarer quality in a critic—sagacity and judgment. This 'Life' is, in his own phrase, 'liberal-

conservative.' No attempt is made to force the person and work of Jesus into the Procrustes bed of a particular theory. The teaching, the miracles, the Virgin Birth and the Resurrection are all discussed with profound sanity. Sanday wrote before Schweitzer had called attention to the eschatology of the Gospels, and I fancy that if he had ever fulfilled his ambition to expand this 'outline' into a full-scale Life of Christ, he would have written otherwise on various issues, the kingdom of God among them; but, as an example of reverent New Testament scholarship at the beginning of the century there is none better.

II.

Books which strike a blow for orthodoxy seldom create such a furore as those less obviously 'on the side of the angels.' Our next book Denney's *Jesus and the Gospel* is a case in point. Denney was probably the greatest New Testament scholar Scotland has produced, and his book was a strong and timely antidote to the 'new theologies' then in the air. It is not a 'Life,' but it is centrally concerned with Christ in the Gospels. 'The idea I have,' he wrote, 'is to show that the Gospel as the apostles preached and believed it can be verified in the mind of Jesus.' No writer in English ever performed that task more triumphantly. The core of the book is a careful study of the mind of Christ as revealed in the two primary Gospel sources, Mark and Q. One by one the relevant sayings of Jesus from the Baptism to the Passion are reviewed until, at the end, Denney can claim that cumulatively they disclose a Person 'who is not only equal to the place which Christian faith assigns him but who assumes that place naturally and spontaneously as his own.' After forty years that argument remains as clear and strong and convincing as ever.

III.

Two years afterwards there appeared in English a book by a young theologian from Alsace named Albert Schweitzer (the German edition was published in 1906). *The Quest of the Historical Jesus* at once created a furore. Three quarters of it were devoted to a survey of the Life-of-Jesus Research (in German and French). It was the last quarter which expounded Schweitzer's own views—and made the stir.

And no wonder. The real Jesus (said Schweitzer) was a strange imperious figure obsessed by an apocalyptic dream in which the 'birth pangs' of the New Age, the Parousia, the Last Judgment and the supernatural kingdom of God followed each other in swift succession. He died to make that dream come true. Though from the Baptism he knew he would be the Messiah, he kept it secret. When he sent out the Twelve, he expected the End of the World would come before they had been round the cities of Israel (Mt 10^{23}). When it did not happen, he altered his forecast. Convinced now that he must endure the pangs himself and die if the End were to come, he marched on Jerusalem not of his own freewill but of dogmatic necessity. The secret of Messiahship, disclosed to the Twelve at Cæsarea Philippi, was betrayed by Judas to the priests, and Jesus flung himself on the Cross, hoping that his death would force God to bring all to pass. *Deo aliter visum.* He died in dereliction. That is his victory. But what of his ethical teaching? That, replies Schweitzer, was only 'an ethic of the interval'—till the supernatural kingdom came. The Kingdom itself needs no ethics.

It is a shattering picture. But is it true? Four grave charges can be levelled against it. (1) Schweitzer uses his sources uncritically. His exegesis practically begins and ends with Matthew, particularly Mt 10^{23}, a saying of very dubious value. (2) He turns a Nelson eye on all evidence in the Synoptics which proclaims the Kingdom a present reality in the ministry of Jesus. (3) He makes nonsense of the ethic of Jesus. And (4) he makes Jesus the deluded victim of a fixed eschatological programme.

If Schweitzer says that the Liberal Jesus never existed, we may retort that his eschatological Jesus never did either. Yet Schweitzer did one really important thing: he compelled scholars to face up to the problem of eschatology in the Gospels, and challenged them to produce a better interpretation than his own. Every writer since 1910 has had to meet that challenge.

IV.

Glover's *Jesus of History* may seem too slight and unsystematic a book to be ranked among our chosen ten. Yet what book in its day had a wider influence, and what book more vividly fulfilled the promise of its title? 'He let me see Jesus,' said Denney of his old teacher A. B. Bruce. Glover did precisely this for many of his contemporaries. Jesus the man, in all his grace, simplicity, sympathy, and charm; a Jesus fond of little children, loving common men and common things; a Teacher of genius who saw and thought in pictures; a Jesus who discovered God the Father, rested wholly on him, and died to reveal him—this was the portrait Glover painted. A Liberal portrait? Yes; but what a spring-like freshness there was in it! More than any other, Glover humanized Jesus, and made him infinitely attractive and alive.

But—and it is a serious but—Glover let us see only one side of Jesus and the gospel. That he saw Jesus through Greek rather than Jewish eyes, is true but understandable. What we do find it harder to understand is his blindness to the theology of the Gospels. Glover has no real idea what the Kingdom of God means in the Gospels; and so far as eschatology is concerned, Schweitzer might never have written. Glover does not see that the person of Jesus is integral to the gospel. The Jesus of History is an incomparably bigger figure than Glover's charming canvas shows.

V.

'Jesus was not a Christian,' observed Wellhausen, 'he was a Jew.' The next writer, Joseph Klauser, himself a Jew, never lets us forget this. Try as he may to be fair, his *Jesus of Nazareth* is really propaganda for Judaism. The Christian reader knows what to expect, and need be neither surprised nor shocked when Klausner claims that all Jesus' ethical teaching can be paralleled somewhere or other in Jewish sources, and dismisses the Virgin Birth, the miracles and the tradition of the Empty Tomb as legends. For Klausner, Jesus is an unorthodox Galilean 'Rab' who, mistakenly believing himself the Messiah, went up to Jerusalem, expecting to triumph, but was seized by the Sadducean priests and crucified by the Romans. The greatness of Jesus, he says, lies in his ethic. 'If ever the day should come and this ethical code be stripped of its wrappings of miracle and mysticism, the book of the ethics of Jesus will be one of the choicest treasures in the literature of Israel for all time.'

The value of this book lies not in these *ex parte* judgments but in the masterly delineation of the background—political, economic, and religious—of the gospel story. His translator, Dr. Danby, rightly claims that 'it represents the best that unimpeachable Jewish learning has to show.' It is a liberal education in rabbinics.

VI.

In 1926 came the German Bultmann's *Jesus*. When we learn that Bultmann, the most sceptical critic since Strauss, is also one of the 'dialectical' theologians, we are tempted to murmur, 'Is Saul also among the prophets?' For, in Bultmann's view, there is not much in the Gospels we can trust. Most of it is to be ascribed to the creation of the early Christian communities.

In spite of this, Bultmann feels he is in a position to reconstruct the message of Jesus. It is an eschatological gospel. Such ideas as the infinite worth of personality or the development of man towards an ideal are foreign to it. Its theme is the coming of the supernatural Kingdom of God (God's gift, not man's achievement) and of the summons to man for decision in view of the impending crisis. Obedience (*Gehorsam*) to God's demands—that is the essence of Jesus' ethic. But who is this person who summons to decision? He is the prophet Jesus, the bearer of the decisive Word of God to men, which sets men in the eschatological Now and challenges them to decide for or against God.

We have said that Bultmann's whole approach is vitiated by excessive scepticism. The charge which Windisch and others have brought against him is that he confuses critical scholarship with theological exegesis. The charge has point. Years ago Loisy complained that Harnack's Jesus was but the reflection of a Liberal Protestant face. Bultmann's Jesus might be said to be the reflection of a Barthian face. *C'est dialectique, mais ce n'est pas histoire.*

VII.

When you put down Bultmann and take up the next book, Middleton Murry's *Life of Jesus*, you pass from the New Testament Seminar in Marburg to Fleet Street at its best. In place of the imperious Prophet calling to *Entscheidung*, there stands a high-souled Man of Genius who, knowing God as his Father, would have all men share his secret. Gone too, is the historical scepticism; for though Murry rejects St. John's evidence, he rightly discerns the essential honesty of Mark's story.

Murry is a sort of post-Schweitzerian Renan. Thus, when halfway through the 'Life,' Jesus the teacher, disappointed by the non-appearance of the Son of Man and the people's rejection of his gospel of God's Fatherhood, assumes the rôle of an apocalyptic *Messias futurus*, who must die like God's Servant if the present world order is to end and the transcendent Kingdom appear, we are reminded of both his predecessors. And when he tells us that the betrayal was 'a put-up job' between Judas and the priests, or describes the immeasurably great man dying in dereliction, we think of the brilliant Alsatian.

Murry's book is a picture of how Jesus appears to a fine-minded and accomplished man of letters. One reads it for its descriptive passages of quite astonishing beauty. It is written with a manifest admiration for Jesus 'divinest when he most is man.' 'We shall look like men,' says Murry, 'on the man Jesus. He will stand our scrutiny. Keep our heads as high as we can, they shall be bowed at the last.'

VIII.

The next book, T. W. Manson's *The Teaching of Jesus* (1931), written in a Northumberland manse,

is perhaps the most original book in our ten. Manson broke new ground in several ways. To begin with, he took seriously Streeter's Four Document Theory and studied our Lord's sayings according to the four sources—Mark, Q, M, and L. Then he proceeded to classify them according to their addressees (the general public, his opponents, his disciples) with at least one challenging result. Liberalism had often assumed that the burden of Jesus' preaching to the multitudes was 'God is your Father and you are all brothers.' Manson's studies led him to very different conclusions. The Fatherhood of God was not a doctrine Jesus preached to the general public; it was a mystery disclosed in private to the disciples. 'For them, he made the Father real, not by argument or by much speaking, but because it was obvious that the Father was the supreme reality of his own life.' Manson's other startling thesis was that the title Son of Man in the Gospels is a *collective* title, a continuation indeed of the Old Testament doctrine of the 'saved and saving Remnant.' Derived from Dn 7 and used by Jesus only after Cæsarea Philippi, it denoted Jesus and his disciples as the new Israel. But his followers failed to rise to the height of their leader's demands, and at last, at the Cross, Jesus stood alone as the true incarnation of the Son of Man. He was rejected and crucified. But his death proved the birth pangs of the Son of Man, and after the Resurrection the Son of Man found new and glorious embodiment in the Church, his own Body, of which he is the Head.

So stated, Manson's theory may not win wide acceptance, but his emphasis on the *societary* side of the title contains deep truth, and along with his other suggestion (mentioned above) must command the respectful attention of all New Testament scholars.

IX.

From England we turn now to France. In 1932, after the Form Critics had been telling us for a decade that we could not write a Life of Christ, the French scholar M. Goguel produced one of nearly six hundred pages. His *Vie de Jésus* has been acclaimed as the best of its kind between the Wars. On the score of mere scholarship this may be so; but the 'Life' is at once lop-sided and disappointing. Lop-sided, because one half of his space goes on prolegomena; and disappointing, because it relies so much on guess-work and speculative psychology and ends up with a Jesus not markedly different from Schweitzer's.

Goguel's Jesus began his Galilean ministry as an eschatological prophet who proclaimed an imminent Kingdom of God and expected a speedy fulfilment of Mt 10^{23}. After a time of initial popularity Herod's menaces drove him to flight, and when he refused to play the rôle of Messianic King following 'the Galilean Lord's Supper,' the people forsook him. But after Peter's Confession the Prophet turned into One who believed that he was destined, after suffering, to appear as the Son of Man and inaugurate the supernatural Kingdom of God. After a visit to Jerusalem at the Feast of Tabernacles and a retreat to Perea, he made his final appeal to Jerusalem on the ensuing Passover (A.D. 28). It failed. His enemies had him arrested and crucified, and he died believing God had deserted him.

We may be forgiven if, as Christians, we refuse to follow M. Goguel in his conjectures. Yet his 'Life' has fine sentences, as witness this one: 'Jesus did not believe that he was the Messiah *although* he had to suffer; he believed that he was the Messiah *because* he had to suffer. This is the great paradox, the great originality, of his gospel.'

X.

The last book in our list, Otto's *The Kingdom of God and the Son of Man*, has been hailed as a turning-point in the study of the Gospels. Certainly it is a very important contribution, and it is therefore unfortunate that, for many of us, it should suffer from two grave faults: (*a*) Otto's adoption of a dubious Synoptic theory (Bussmann's) and (*b*) his conviction that the key to the Story of Jesus is to be found in the Book of Enoch—a view which Bultmann for several good reasons dismisses as 'fantastic.'

On three issues—eschatology, the Messiahship, and the Last Supper—Otto has true and notable things to say. With Schweitzer he maintains that the Kingdom of God is an eschatological idea; but he sees, as Schweitzer did not, that the Kingdom is already present and active in the ministry of Jesus. He thus anticipates C. H. Dodd in the doctrine of 'realized eschatology' which has so vivified and illumined our study of the Gospels. Second, in portraying Jesus as 'the eschatological redeemer,' he finds (as of course Goguel and many others before had found) the key to our Lord's conception of his person in a profound synthesis of the Son of Man with the Servant of the Lord. And, third, he interprets the Last Supper as an act of 'prophetic symbolism' in which Jesus not only predicts his atoning death but, by inviting his disciples to eat and drink, offers them 'a share in the power of the broken Christ.' Along these three lines and in many smaller points of exegesis (*e.g.*, the hard sayings preserved in Mt 11^{12} and Lk 17^{21}) Otto has set New Testament scholars thinking in most

fruitful ways, and his last book may well prove to be as important as his *Idea of the Holy*.

XI.

Having completed our survey, we are painfully conscious of omissions, of important studies on various aspects of the Gospels and the Life of Jesus which might have figured among our chosen ten : C. H. Dodd's *Parables of the Kingdom* which helped so many of us, Vincent Taylor's admirable *Jesus and His Sacrifice*, William Manson's difficult but deep-going lectures on *Jesus the Messiah*, J. W. Bowman's *The Intention of Jesus*, and so on. But, looking back over our ten, we are struck by one highly significant fact. The last quarter of the century has produced only one big critical Life of Jesus—Goguel's. One might have imagined that the writing of a Life would be the crowning ambition of every *Neutestamentler* worthy of his salt. Why then are the experts in our day apparently so reluctant to make the great venture ?

It is not enough to answer that they realize that the materials at their disposal are not sufficient for a full-dress biography. This is true ; but it was true also in the nineteenth century when innumerable ' Lives ' appeared. Part of the answer is undoubtedly to be found in the single word *Formgeschichte*. Before its advent after World War I the task seemed easier. So long as scholars believed that in Mark, the earliest Gospel, they had a firm and reliable outline of Christ's Ministry, they had a foundation on which to build. But the Form Critics—and especially K. L. Schmidt in his *Der Rahmen der Geschichte Jesu* (1919)—made scholars much less sure of their belief. There arose an uneasy suspicion that Schmidt and Co. had ' knocked the Marcan scaffolding to pieces ' and left us with only a handful of scattered *pericopæ* before the Passion Story was reached.

Now it is true that the Marcan hypothesis has taken some hard knocks ; but Schmidt's view is a great exaggeration. As C. H. Dodd showed (in THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, xliii. [June 1932]), ' the Marcan order does represent a genuine succession of events, within which movement and development can be traced.' Mark still can be a basis on which to build.

No, Form Criticism is not a complete answer. Perhaps the influence of Barthianism must also be reckoned with. For Barth actually suggests that ' so far as we can get back to the historical Jesus, there is nothing remarkable to be found in his life and character and teaching ' (D. M. Baillie, *God was in Christ*, 36). Form Criticism, Barthianism —or does the real reason lie, as Vincent Taylor suggests, otherwhere—in a sort of intellectual sloth, a lack of courage to ' re-tell the Story of Stories to a dying world ? '

Whatever the reasons, to the writer, at any rate, the present reluctance to make the attempt seems very regrettable. In many ways we are in a better position to make the attempt than we were a century ago. The textual critics have provided us with a reliable text. The source-critics, and particularly Streeter, have analysed our Synoptic Gospels into their component parts, and helped us to appraise the underlying sources. We know a great deal more about Pharisees and Sadducees and the background of the gospel story generally. Thanks to Schweitzer, Otto, and Dodd we have a much better understanding of the eschatological data in the Gospels and of key concepts like the Kingdom of God and the Son of Man. We understand the parables better and their *Sitz im Leben Jesu*. And so far as the miracles are concerned, we have moved far (witness the books of D. S. Cairns and C. S. Lewis) from the position of Matthew Arnold and others in the nineteenth century.

These items are all on the credit side. Of course, on the debit side, many difficulties remain. We are not yet sure how far we can use the Fourth Gospel as a historical source, though we are much less contemptuous of it than some critics were fifty years ago. There is the problem of the Virgin Birth. Shall that particular tradition find a place in a critical Life, or must we relegate it to an appendix ? Above all, granting that Mark can be trusted to afford a broadly trustworthy outline of the Ministry, how are we to fit into it the narratives, sayings, and parables from our other sources ?

Yet, when all difficulties are admitted, the task should not be so daunting as it seems. To be sure, we cannot make a closely articulated chronological scheme of the Ministry with precise dates accurately inserted. But there is much we can do. We can, with some accuracy, reconstruct the background of the Early Years. We can depict the general trend of the Ministry. We can give some account of the main themes in our Lord's teaching. We can pick out the main crises, like Cæsarea Philippi, in the Life, and of course we have material to describe the last and greatest crisis which we call the Passion and Resurrection.

The present writer has recently made a very modest attempt to do all this. He is very conscious how inadequate it is. But his hope is that others much abler than himself will arise to better his performance. There is nothing our world needs more than a fresh and truer vision of the Life of lives.

Doctrine of Man.

The Goodness of the Godless.

By Professor the Reverend John Marsh, M.A., D.Phil., The University, Nottingham.

There is a story told about Martineau when once he read a paper to a gathering of orthodox Divines. He had to leave before discussion time was fully spent, and, as he left, the following conversation is alleged to have taken place between two dignitaries of the Church. A: 'What a delightful and charming fellow Martineau is.' B: 'Yes and what a pity to think that "without doubt he shall perish everlastingly."' The phenomenon of goodness outside the closed ranks of the chosen people must always cause the Christian to reflect what a pity it is that the nice Pagan must perish everlastingly. Further, if perish he must, what conclusions must be drawn about the significance and effectiveness of his goodness. And, even more alarmingly, what must he conclude about his own virtue? What is the nature and what is the value of the goodness of the Godless?

In the first place it needs to be said that moral action cannot be isolated from a total attitude and committal of life. The fact that certain virtues appear to be identical in Christians and Pagans does not at once put the two classes on the same footing. It would be much more accurate to think not of identity of virtues but rather of an overlapping of moralities in respect of certain virtues. For in the end our morals are a fruit of our belief; and what we are called upon to judge, as between Pagans and Christians, is not simply a collection of actions but a system of faith and morals. It is in this regard significant that in the New Testament, in Gospels and Epistles alike, moral exhortation is invariably the consequence of faith. 'By their fruits ye shall know them.' 'I beseech you therefore, brethren, . . .' Christian behaviour, and Pagan behaviour like it, are part of a total attitude to life and cannot, for purposes of comparison, be isolated from the totality.

Nevertheless it is only realistic to recognize that there are very wide divergences between Pagan and Christian moralities. The nice Pagan, whom the Christian meets as a neighbour or as a fellow-worker in office or shop, may hold to some virtues together with the Christian. But there will be Christian virtues to which the Pagan will not aspire and a good deal of Pagan practice which the Christian would reject out of hand. It is the height of moral unrealism to think that there is no ethical distinction between Godliness and Godlessness. The decaying morality of our day is a potent witness to this.

Yet the Christian has no need to deny the name of virtue to Pagan moral excellence. For the moral philosopher, Christian or otherwise, the Pagan who consistently speaks the truth, is in this regard entirely indistinguishable from the Christian who does so. Virtue is virtue wherever it be found. Augustine was not writing as a moral philosopher when he described Pagan virtues as splendid vices. Paul leaves us in no doubt that the Gentiles 'shew the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or excusing one another.' They are quite capable of moral action, and open to the praise or blame which properly attaches to responsible action.

What then is the difference between Godly and Godless goodness? It is not in ethical practice save where Pagan ethics challenge Christian ethics. It is much more in the realm of theory that the difference becomes clear, for the Godless can do no other than ascribe his goodness to himself; whereas the Christian can do no other than ascribe his goodness to God. This is a point of fundamental importance for Christian ethics and theology. From the very beginning, Christian conviction has held that virtues, even of the simple sort, are supernatural. When Paul writes to the Church at Colossæ, he propounds their moral instruction in the pictorial terms of the Baptismal ceremony. At Baptism, converts take off their old clothes and put on a new garment. So must they put off the old man and put on a new, but the new man is Christ and the various garments we put on are all 'putting on Christ.' In the early years of this century it doubtless seemed strange and offensive to think of kindness as a supernatural virtue; but after two wars and the growth of concentration camps and the devilries of modern oppression, we have many tragically practical grounds for recognising Paul's point. Kindness was Christ's garment; and we can wear it in the end only in Him.

It is at this point that so many believers are less than fully Christian. It is desperately hard to give up the claim to one's virtue and to recognize one's own goodness as belonging to God. Moreover in doing so we seem to be flying

in the face of ethical facts, since we all know how much at times our human will is involved in a struggle to achieve virtuous action. But there is another range of human experience open to the pious soul, where it is clearly and gladly seen that—

> . . . every virtue we possess,
> And every victory won,
> And every thought of holiness,
> Are His alone.

There is a unanimous testimony from the Saints of God to this effect. Is it not possible that we have a like testimony from Christ Himself when He replied to the rich young ruler, 'Why callest thou me good? there is none good but one, that is, God.'

But the painful point of Martineau's story lies not in a comparison of present behaviour but of future destiny. And here again Christian and Pagan theories are at variance. There are indeed many Christians who find it difficult, if not impossible, entirely to discard the old Pagan ways of thinking; but that does not change the essential features of Christian truth. In the Christian tradition man's destiny has been pictured in terms of a Great Assize. But, contrary to our human moral anticipation, the Great Assize is not a Divine 'whodunnit'; for if that were so the universal sentence at the Assize would be condemnation. Indeed the Scripture makes it almost intolerably plain that we are all, Pagan and Christian alike, worthy of condemnation. None of us, whether Christian or Pagan, has virtue enough to plead 'Not Guilty' at the Last Judgment. None of us can finally carry through the pretence that we are all we would like, or meant, ourselves to be; much less that we are what God, or an absolute morality, would have us be. But—and here the whole universal difference between Paganism and Christianity becomes evident—there is a plea which is effective at the last day. It is simply 'He loved me, and gave himself for me.' 'By grace are ye saved through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast.' 'There is therefore now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus.'

What then must be our conclusion? That it is not on goodness that either Christians or Pagans are saved or condemned. There is a higher principle of judgment and discernment with moral conduct. God has made that known in the forgiving and redeeming love of Jesus Christ. Did the Pagan but know it, in his own goodness the Divine life is being lived and perhaps the most needed apologetic of our day is one that would convince the Pagan that all unknowing he has been drawing upon Divine resources for the practice of those very virtues which cause Christians concern lest the doer of them should perish. In the end the Martineau story is the most eloquent testimony to the fact that Pagan virtues are really Christian fruit grown by a miracle of Divine grafting upon alien stock.

Literature.

THE CHRISTIAN INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY.

Faith and History (Nisbet; 16s. net), by Professor Reinhold Niebuhr, has for sub-title, 'A Comparison of Christian and Modern Views of History,' but the scope of the work (his most important, it may be allowed to the publishers, since his Gifford Lectures on 'The Nature and Destiny of Man') is more precisely indicated in the remark near its beginning that 'the time is ripe to survey both the modern and the Christian and classical ideas of man's relation to history.' In making this survey Dr. Niebuhr catches up ideas on which he has touched in his 'Beyond Tragedy' and in the second series of his Gifford Lectures, and gives us a comprehensive study of 'the total problem' of the relation between Christian faith and the conceptions of history that may be described as the classical and the modern.

In the earlier part of the work Dr. Niebuhr contends that the classical and the modern attempts to find meaning in history are at one in interpreting history as rationally intelligible. In classicism the effort is made to dissociate the power of human reason, more specifically man's capacity for conceptual knowledge, which is timeless and Divine, from the world of Nature and history, which is subject to change and endless recurrence. In the modern conception, in which the idea of development is utilized, history is regarded as in itself a redemptive process; as man's power and freedom increase, evil will decrease and the enigmas of life be solved. Dr. Niebuhr expounds both views with a wealth

of historical instance and an incisiveness and pungency in logical analysis such as we have learned to expect of him. Christian faith, as he contends, distinguishes itself from the classical view of history (and is so far in agreement with the modern view) in thinking of mankind as moving to a significant future and not as being involved in recurrent cycles of the natural world. And again, it distinguishes itself from the modern view (and is so far in agreement with classicism) in conceiving the facts and events of Nature and history as pointing beyond themselves to a higher source of meaning, to the larger realm of mystery in which it finds its own life. 'Both the classical and the modern versions of history's rational intelligibility cannot do full justice, either to the multifarious vitalities and configurations of history or to the tragic antinomies of life which are the consequence of the corruption of freedom.'

In the later, and longer, part of the work Dr. Niebuhr advances to an exposition in detail of the Christian view of history, disclaiming from the outset any purpose of representing it as a rationally coercive view; at the most it is rationally relevant, as offering an account of life and history in which all facts and antinomies are comprised. In his exposition he would steer a middle course between an 'atrophied orthodoxy' and a 'too compliant liberalism.' But it seems a mistake to allow that 'he has made orthodox theology relevant to our secular crisis' (D. R. Davies). Christian theology certainly, but hardly orthodox theology. He so vitalizes and even transfigures orthodoxy as to change its very meaning.

After expounding the Biblical view of history Dr. Niebuhr dwells more fully on the proper task of the Christian apologist in the modern world. In pursuing the task of showing the relevance of the Christian view of life and history the Christian apologist must avoid certain temptations to error. In particular the truth of the Christian gospel is not to be regarded as merely a truth of reason validated by rational coherence with other systems of meaning. It is apprehended 'at the very limit of all systems of meaning.' There it has the power to challenge the moods of complacency and of despair that have in the past been the fruits of 'worldly wisdom' and are all too manifest in our time: the complacency of those who, with, for example, Karl Marx, have completed life too simply, and the despair of those who, with, for example, Nietzsche, can find no meaning at all in life.

It is as falling under the conception of the 'limit' that two of Dr. Niebuhr's concluding chapters might be taken. One is on Christian morality with its law of love, which is declared to be the final norm of the self as free spirit; and the other is on Christian eschatological expectation, which is represented as necessary for a Christian interpretation of history. We can but commend the study of these and all the other thoughtful chapters of this eloquent and prophetic writer.

W. Fulton.

THE IMITATION OF CHRIST.

Apart from the Scriptures no religious book, and probably no book of any kind, has been so read and befingered in Europe as *The Imitation of Christ*. It is much less than a full presentation of Christianity. But what an immeasurable ministry it has exercised! When Maggie Tulliver in 'The Mill on the Floss,' in all the tumult of her soul, came upon an old copy of it, and, reading here and there the passages marked with now faded ink by some long-dead hand, was directed into peace, she took a well-worn path, trodden by the most diverse types of people. Arndt, the mystic, read it in his day, and was by it changed into the man that he became, with his passion for what grew to be home mission work and much else of outstanding value to humanity and to Jesus Christ. Voltaire chanced upon it in an odd moment, and something in it found a lodgment in his mind, and haunted him at times. Chalmers, the mighty evangelical, found in it something to which he kept returning. All kinds of minds have been influenced by this little book. How was it done? Anatole France, perhaps, gives us a clue in that passage in which he declares that ordinary men have, on occasion, been much more successful in depicting themselves than have most of the folk of genius. 'Their portrait is that of all; each of us recognizes in the adventures of their minds his own moral and philosophical adventures. Hence the interest we take in their confidences. When they speak of themselves, it is as if they spoke of everybody. When we listen to their admissions, they seem to issue from ourselves. Their examination of conscience is as profitable to us as it is to them. Their confessions form a manual of confession for the use of the entire community. And manuals of this sort contribute to the amelioration of the moral person, provided that in them the sin be represented without hypocritical extenuation, and above all without those horrible exaggerations that produce despair.' All which seems to fit the *Imitation*. How perfect, for example, is its uncannily accurate description of a temptation. 'For first there cometh to the mind a bare thought of evil, then a strong imagination thereof, afterwards delight, and evil motion, and then consent. And so by little and little our

wicked enemy getteth complete entrance, for that he is not resisted at the beginning.'

There are, of course, many versions of the work in English. But here comes another—*The Imitation of Christ*, a new translation by Edgar Daplyn, F.R.S.L. (Latimer House; 6s. net). There are two reasons for its issue. 'Controversialists deliberately cut out what they disapproved, or clouded the true significance with vague words.' 'In the present translation the whole text is given as it stands in the author's own handwriting.' The additions are not to me of much account; but an author has rights which ought to be respected. The other reason is perhaps more doubtful—that to be really comprehensible to it a classic ought to be retranslated into the living language of each generation. Many may agree with L. P. Jacks that 'in respect of style and lucidity this is by far the best translation I have so far read.' Certainly the *Imitation* is not out of date, and left behind. The early Buddhists used to speak wistfully of 'the coolness' that the flustered human spirit, as we say, can attain. More than a breath of that might well find its way to our bustled modern minds and souls through a re-reading of this calm and healing spiritual classic.

A. J. Gossip.

THE JEWS AND JESUS.

The problem with which St. Paul wrestled in Ro 9–11 is still as acute, and seemingly as far from solution, as ever it was. A full-scale treatment of it will be found in *The Jewish People and Jesus Christ*, by Jakób Jocz, Ph.D. (S.P.C.K.; 21s. net). Dr. Jocz is a Hebrew Christian, though this fact is never obtruded, and his discussion is scrupulously fair. This is frankly acknowledged by Dr. David Daube in a brief Preface. The book is learned, well documented, clearly written, and even deeply moving.

After an introductory chapter Dr. Jocz writes chapters of some fifty pages each on Jesus Christ and the Synagogue, the Church and the Jews, Contemporary Judaism and Jesus Christ, Primitive Hebrew Christianity, and Contemporary Hebrew Christianity. The treatment of these themes is mainly historical, and to the question, 'How did it happen that Jesus of Nazareth became a stranger to His own people?' Dr. Jocz's answer is emphatic: 'Between Jesus and the Jews stands the *Christian* Church.' As to the position of Hebrew Christianity, 'the conflict between faith in the One Catholic and Apostolic Church and the spirit of national separatism breaks out in all its acuteness. . . . Abraham's experience is the experience of every true Jewish Christian.'

Yet when everything has been said on the history of the relation between the Jews and Jesus, Dr. Jocz is convinced that the problem is in the last resort religious rather than historical. To this Dr. Daube assents, saying that 'he certainly agrees that the conflict between Synagogue and Church always was and still is about the question of the divinity of Jesus, not about any minor issues.' Hence, the final chapter of the book is entitled 'Judaism and Christianity,' and defines the theological issues between the two faiths. Judaism and Christianity differ radically in their conceptions of the Unity of God, Man, Free Will, Sin, Mediation, the Messiah, the Torah, and Revelation. The most significant difference between Church and Synagogue is that in 'Christian thinking, God's transcendence is overcome not by the arbitrary act of human piety but by the self-chosen and self-willed manifestation of God in the person of Jesus Christ; in Judaism it is overcome by *man himself*.' Judaism knows the 'evil inclination' (*yetser hara'*), it does not acknowledge 'original sin'; 'man only sins, but is *not sinful*.' Hence he is entirely free to choose and to do the good, if he will. 'The Jew stands in no need of salvation, all he requires is Atonement.' There is therefore no need for a Mediator, and to insist that there is is to compromise the Unity of God. Some modern Jews even go so far as to say that for the Gentile the way to God is through Jesus, but that the Jew, who is already within the Covenant, is spared that round-about way.

Since Jew and Christian both acknowledge the Old Testament Scriptures it must seem inexplicable that they can differ so radically in their views of human competence. The reason why they do so differ must be twofold, partly that the Cross brought to light what after all is not so blindingly clear in the Old Testament, and partly that the very conflict between Jew and Christian has sharpened the differences between the opposing views.

The issue, as Dr. Jocz puts it, is anything but a merely academic one. It is desperately relevant to the situation as it faces the Christian Church in these days of still-lingering faith in man and in his ability to work out his own salvation. Many Christians, who regard the doctrine of original sin as a libel on decent human nature, are really more Jewish than Christian in their outlook. Dr. Jocz, indeed, says that behind the Jewish attitude to Jesus Christ there stands a distinct philosophy of life not necessarily peculiar to the Synagogue, though naturally he does not labour this in his book. But the minister who is concerned to preach the gospel to a generation which still clings pathetically to its optimism will learn much from this book, especially from its final chapter.

C. R. North.

THE GREAT REVIVAL OF THE NINETEENTH CENTURY.

Dr. J. Edwin Orr, the author of *The Second Evangelical Awakening in Britain* (Marshall, Morgan and Scott; 17s. 6d. net), is justly surprised that nothing like his book has hitherto appeared. For he makes it abundantly clear by the documented results of his research that the Revival of 1859–65 was on an equal or greater scale compared with the movement led by Wesley. Perhaps the explanation is that it led to no new ecclesiastical divisions, being indeed an eirenical influence, and that, welcomed by and operating within the churches, its result was simply the enhancement of their spiritual life, the quickening of Home and Foreign Mission energies, and a vast addition to their membership.

This book is largely a compilation of such information as that about prayer meetings of railway workers and of policemen in Glasgow, and about open-air meetings on Glasgow Green in 1859 and 1860 numbering twenty thousand from which inquirers adjourned to nearby churches or theatres for personal dealing which went on till midnight. Obviously there is bound to be monotony if not dullness in the perusal of the mass of this material collected from America, Ulster, Scotland, and every part of England and Wales. But the total impact of the evidence is tremendous.

One feature of these years following 1859 was that the Revival was leaderless yet all-pervading. Dozens of names are mentioned of those who were independently active in various ways and districts. The Movement gave rise to a host of religious and philanthropic agencies. The Booths were active revivalists before they started the Salvation Army. Barnardo was a convert of 1862. In that year Quarrier's Homes were established and the National Bible Society of Scotland in 1861. The first modern Œcumenical Conference on Foreign Missions was held in Liverpool in 1860. The Y.M.C.A. Movement was lifted to a new level of popular success. These giant missionaries, Richards of China and Gilmour of Manchuria, were converts in 1859 and 1862 and to the end of his life Dr. Alexander Whyte of Edinburgh looked back to 1859 as one of the greatest experiences he had known.

And in America D. L. Moody had been converted in 1858. It may be a surprise to many to find only now this mention of Moody. For the lively and affectionate recollection of his rich, warm, human personality cherished and handed on by people like Henry Drummond and George Adam Smith and many others made his the outstanding name associated with recent revival. Yet the facts are quite plain. The tremendous impulse which revival received through Moody may be regarded as the second and culminating phase of the 1859 Movement. It was in churches that had already quite recently experienced revival and in a soil already prepared that Moody sowed new seed and immediately reaped a mighty harvest.

It is less happy to urge that in the Second Great Awakening there ought to be included all the efforts for revival during the last seventy years. Without disparaging such value as they had it would be better to recognize that the campaigns associated with the names of Torrey and Chapman and Alexander and Fletcher and others, conducted with evangelical fervour and a wistful recollection of earlier days, belong to a different category from the spontaneous, pervasive, infectious, and sweeping Movement of 1859.

R. W. Stewart.

REALISM AND IDEALISM.

A few years ago a leading philosopher of his day was responsible for the saying that 'no sane philosophy has ever been exclusively realistic or idealistic,' and one of the most distinguished thinkers of to-day, Dr. Wilbur Marshall Urban, makes this dictum the text of his profound but fascinating book, *Beyond Realism and Idealism* (Allen and Unwin; 18s. net). He approaches his conclusions by many difficult and devious routes, but he gets there, and, if there are some unnecessary repetitions, this is probably the resultant of a life-time spent in the teaching of philosophy to students of merely average capacity, and even the most erudite amongst his readers will be glad of the occasional respite, thus afforded, from continuous intellectual strain. Dr. Urban is fond of telling us that a problem is by no means as simple as it appears, and we come repeatedly to believe this and profit by the discovery.

There are two methods of reconciling the oppositions between idealism and realism. One is to expand, or reinterpret, both terms so that the one comes to include practically all that is contended for by the other, and the difference turns out to be only in a name. Dr. Urban disapproves of this peace where there is no peace. His method is to discover the minimal demands of both realism and idealism, and then show that these demands are complementary to one another and that neither life nor thought can healthily persist unless the demands are conjointly met. Realism insists that for genuine knowledge, and in order especially to avoid merely private views, the object of knowledge must be independent of the mind. On the other hand the claim of idealism is that the world must be intelligible, and

only the product of mind can fulfil this requirement. In a most instructive chapter it is suggested that realism has made an ' unholy alliance ' with naturalism, and Dr. Urban, treating with much freshness a well-worn theme, shows how impossible it is for naturalism to explain mind, and how poverty-stricken is its attempt to provide for the objectivity of values. A naturalism which attempts to do without idealism ends in futility and frustration, and a science which does not even expect to reach any meaningful conclusions is self-destructive. The religiously minded who are dismayed by the devastating conclusions of naturalistic writers will be relieved when so acute a thinker as our author brings against the latter the charge of disingenuousness and philosophical ' double-book-keeping ' in their use of the word ' nature.' When they wish to attract, they equate it with ' all that is ' ; when they wish to criticise they limit it to that part alone which is susceptible of rigorous scientific method. Also, students who in their earlier days spent many weary days and nights in trying to reconcile the contradictions of Kant, will be comforted in being told that his ambiguity is ' to his eternal honour.'

W. S. URQUHART.

HUMAN NATURE IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

Whenever Professor A. R. Johnson writes so much as a brochure international Old Testament scholarship is wont to sit up and take notice. His latest instalment of prolegomena to what appears to be shaping itself into something like a theology of the Old Testament is *The Vitality of the Individual in the Thought of Ancient Israel* (University of Wales Press ; 6s. net). Dr. Johnson describes it as ' the first of a series of monographs designed to elucidate the famous saying of Habakkuk (2^{4b}) ' : R.V. ' the just shall live by his faith.' In it he makes a thorough examination of Hebrew words descriptive of aspects of human nature, words which are so often the despair of the translator. The chief of them are *nephesh* (E.VV. usually ' soul '), *ruach* (' spirit '), *basar* (' flesh '), and *lebh* (' heart '). His main thesis is that ' in Israelite thought man is conceived, not so much in dual fashion as " body " and " soul," but synthetically as a unit of vital power or (in current terminology) a psycho-physical organism.' That is to say, the various members and secretions of the body, such as the bones, the heart, the bowels, and the kidneys, as well as the flesh and blood, can all be thought of as revealing psychical properties.'

This thesis is, of course, not new, but nowhere, perhaps, is it so fully documented. Indeed, Dr. Johnson half apologizes for the fullness of the notes, saying that they are intended as much for his own future use as for those who may wish to examine the evidence for his statements or to pursue a similar line of inquiry for themselves. Some, at least, of his readers will be grateful that he has shared these details of his researches with them.

Dr. Johnson, as is well known, has argued for what he calls ' extensions ' of human personality in the Old Testament thought of man, meaning that a man's word, his name, his property, and particularly his offspring, have something of his life and power. Nevertheless, in this present work he criticises the late Dr. Wheeler Robinson's view of a ' diffusion of consciousness,' the theory that ' the various organs and limbs of the body are to be regarded as functioning independently or as being " self-operative." ' Instead, he would explain language which seems to point to ' diffusion ' as due rather to synecdoche (*pars pro toto*). Language like that of Job : ' When the ear heard, it pronounced me happy ; and when the eye saw, it bore witness to me,' should not be taken too literally. The distinction between extension of personality and diffusion of consciousness may seem subtle, but Dr. Johnson would have us guard the principle of the unity of (individual) personality, even in very early times.

It is of interest to note that although Dr. Johnson employs the familiar symbols J, E, D, and P, it is with a different emphasis from that of orthodox criticism. He explains that his use of the sigla ' should certainly not be held to imply an acceptance of the normal attempt to present the religion of Israel in its historical development which is now commonly associated with the name of Wellhausen.' He appears to contemplate the possibility that the documents may represent different but contemporary *strata* rather than consecutive *stages* of thought. This opens up a large question, and one on which there is certainly going to be a great deal of discussion.

C. R. NORTH.

PREACHING.

That wise man, Principal W. M. Macgregor, once committed himself to a very questionable finding. ' Some people are slow to realize that there are subjects, for example preaching, which cannot profitably be taught by way of lectures.'

No doubt at all most of us can learn to preach only by preaching, as one can learn to walk only by walking. Yet, when a youth, proposing to become a surgeon, goes to the medical faculty, they do not tell him scornfully that lectures on surgery are a sheer waste of time, and with that add, But there is a patient, and here is a knife,

just set to work. So, if wisely used, the mass of books on preaching are serviceable, and most of them something more. Probably pride of place among them is still held by Phillips Brooks' now elderly work. W. M. Macgregor himself, at long last concussed into the writing of it, gave us an outstanding book. But here comes another that will bring inspiration and refreshing to many an one—*This Grace Wherein We Stand*, by the Rev. George Johnstone Jeffrey, D.D. (Hodder and Stoughton; 6s. net).

Dr. Jeffrey has many qualifications for his task. Himself one of the most distinguished Scottish preachers of the day, he has the right to speak about it. Naturally a shy man, he has a passion for Jesus Christ that will not hide, and an enthusiasm for the preaching of the wonderful gospel that is infectious. His alert and eager mind has read unusually widely in all kinds of fields, and that with seeing eyes. He knows his own heart, and the joys and troubles of the ministerial life with almost disconcerting accuracy, so that, like the students of whom Epictetus tells us, flocking out from the lecture-room, who kept asking, 'Who has been telling Rufus about me?' we come on our own photograph upon page after page, and recognize moods we had thought to be peculiarly our own, and, what is better, the correction of them.

And there is one thing more. Every one knows that Charles Lamb wanted to say Grace over many things besides his food. If Dr. Jeffrey is to treat the Lord God Almighty with any seemliness, he will humbly include in his daily thanksgiving the fact, for fact it certainly is, that He has seen fit to endow His servant with the art of writing, a great gift indeed. Dr. Jeffrey tells us in his wise way 'the older one grows, the slower one is to recommend any book or author to another. The book that sets one man ablaze leaves another cold.' True. Yet here is a book to be highly commended, and with confidence.

A. J. Gossip.

Whatever else is to be said about *The Ministry*, edited by Mr. J. Richard Spann (Abingdon Cokesbury Press; $2.00), this at least is certain, that its editor believes in it wholeheartedly. 'The reading of this volume,' so he confidently writes, 'will bring renewed inspiration and help to every earnest pastor and other interpreter of Christ. It will be indispensable to all young people.' These are tall claims. Speaking for ourselves, we have found some of it as depressing as anything we have come across for years. 'The church becomes a kind of club, and the pastor is the manager of the club, looking after the details of organization.' 'I know personally many ministers who actually use a study very little in any particular week. Many of them have what they CALL studies, but the real character of these rooms is that of offices.' 'Often a man will keep thinking all the week that he will get some time to sit in his study, but—finally the best a man can do is to have a little while alone on Saturday night, with Sunday morning already staring him in the face.' That is a sorry picture of the ministry, of a chivied soul immersed in secondary things which leave him no atom of room for the central matters, seeing week after week slip past with nothing of primary importance done, or so much as attempted.

The book consists of seventeen papers on various aspects of the ministerial life by men reputed to be experts in their subjects. Some of these are stimulating; some much less so, at times surely even superficial. The book will find its public, and make its appeal. But, for some of us, it is not, perhaps, so outstanding as its editor believes.

In *One Catholic and Apostolic Church* (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net), a series of Broadcast Talks, representatives of the Anglican, Congregational, Presbyterian, Methodist, and Roman Catholic Churches take part. With the exception of the last, they have all reached the level at which they refuse to unchurch one another; they are, as one of them says, not 'concerned to prove others wrong, but rather to discover in what sense and to what extent they are right.' But, at the same time, each one of them sets forth with candour and honesty the faith and life of his own Church. The friendlier attitude is all to the good even if it does not pass securely from the negative to the positive, and perhaps the time has not yet come for the building of the more permanent bridge between the narrower and the world-wide loyalty.

All the Churches claim to be Catholic and Apostolic, but assign differing meanings to the terms. The Anglican representative states clearly his interpretation, and incidentally, but fitly, stresses the parochial responsibility of a national Church; the Congregationalist makes a useful distinction between 'sectarianism' and 'denominationalism,' and desires to transcend both; the Presbyterian reaches perhaps the highest level of argument in setting forth the organic unity of the Church under that system; and the Methodist will win sympathetic appreciation for the distinctive characteristics which he shows to belong to that communion. The Roman Catholic is overburdened by the problem of infallibility, and will hardly convince the members of other Churches that he has freed himself sufficiently from the mediæval habit of 'begging the question' upon vital points at issue. In a concluding and

additional talk Canon Reeves, the Anglican representative, tries to convey something of the inspiration of Amsterdam, and succeeds in beautifully indicating the regulative ideal which the Assembly left on the minds of its members, and in many cases impressed on their hearts.

Talking about God (Epworth Press; 2s. 6d. net), by the Rev. Frederic Greeves, M.A., of Didsbury College, Manchester, consists of two series of Broadcast Talks. The first series, 'About God,' was delivered in the People's Service of the Light Programme of the B.B.C.; it seeks to prepare the way for the Christian gospel. The second series, 'The Light of the World,' was delivered in Christmas week in the early morning 'Lift up your Hearts' programme; it seeks within the limits set by five four-minute talks actually to preach the Christian gospel. The talks are couched in simple, non-technical language and admirably adapted to their purpose.

It is a pleasure to see a plain and unpretentious aid to Bible study entrusted to an author fully conversant with the results of modern scholarship and the issues it raises. The Rev. John W. Waterhouse's *Into His Marvellous Light* (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net) is a competent, educative, and edifying book for any circle willing to take for a subject First and Second Peter and Jude, and it will convince those who use it that these short Epistles contain a wealth of matter.

The discussion of the problem of pain in *A Parson's Thoughts on Pain*, by the Rev. Gordon E. Childs, M.A. (Mowbray; 2s. 6d. net), is moulded by the resolve of the writer to rely on his own experiences. He had himself been 'through it' as a result of his sufferings in the First World War, and, with the knowledge thus burnt into his soul, he seeks to help others by means of this little book. It is, as might be expected, a straightforward piece of work, and its re-issue—with a Foreword by the late Bishop of Ely—will be of immense help to the sufferers themselves, to the ministers who visit them, and to doctors, nurses, and others who care for them in their weakness. The author's criticism of unsympathetic platitudes and of certain outworn doctrines on this topic are refreshing in their directness and vigour of expression.

Canon F. Harrison, who is Canon-residentiary, Chancellor and Librarian of York Minister, has published an interesting little book called *The Bible in Britain* (Nelson; 7s. 6d. net). It is a straightforward account of the history of the Bible in our land, dealing mainly with the successive translations. The greater part of the book surveys in detail the Reformation Period, but the story is continued to the present day and the Revised Standard Version. It is a publication for the general reader, but the student will find it a convenient summary of useful information.

The Church (Pickering and Inglis; 10s. 6d. net), edited by Mr. J. B. Watson, is describable as a 'Symposium of Principles and Practice,' being a collection of short papers by seventeen writers on subjects connected with Church doctrine, polity, and witness. They appear to be at one in urging that the doctrine of the Church is sufficiently stated in the New Testament, that the polity of the Church is authoritatively described there, and that there also the proper witness of the Church unto the Lord Jesus Christ is to be found. It may be gathered that the standpoint is Biblicist, and even a casual reading of the papers would show that the writers, generally speaking, are united in holding that the great organized churches of Christendom are aberrant forms of Church order, that the true government of the Church is on the Congregational principle, and that the Church's witness should be on evangelical lines—not that the older forms of evangelicalism are to be exactly followed. In a word, this book would deny the validity of the idea of 'development' as applied to Church life and practice.

Our Faith (S.C.M.; 7s. 6d. net), by Dr. Emil Brunner (translation by Mr. John W. Rilling), is a re-issue of a work almost unknown in Great Britain, where it first appeared in 1936. It is truly claimed that the work serves as a simple introduction to Professor Brunner's theology; and it must be gratifying to the author that it has been translated not only into English but also into French, Dutch, Danish, Hungarian, and Japanese. There are in it thirty-five short papers or essays of some two or three pages each; and they are arranged in what is usually called the logical order of theology, beginning with God and His relation to the world and leading through the Christian doctrines of man and sin, Christ and salvation, to those of the Christian life and the Christian hope. It is delightful to see in these pages a great Christian thinker as it were unbending and talking to us as man to man with refreshing directness and simplicity.

SHORTER NOTICES.

There is a number of reprints and, what may be called, without offence, minor books which deserve

mention. One of the former which obtained wide circulation and appreciation is *The Christ of the Indian Road*, by Dr. E. Stanley Jones. This re-issue is the thirty-first edition of what the publishers call 'the most famous book ever written about Christ in India.' The publishers are Messrs. Hodder and Stoughton and the price is 6s. net.

Another fresh re-issue is *The Spontaneous Expansion of the Church and the Causes which Hinder It*, by Mr. Roland Allen (World Dominion Press; 5s. net). It is a challenge to the Church to adopt Apostolic methods and give a body of converts, however small, liberty to grow by the force of their own life.

The 'minor' books include *The Unshakeable Kingdom*, by the Rev. W. Francis Gibbons, B.D. (Marshall, Morgan and Scott; 6s. net), an exposition of eight verses from the twelfth chapter of Hebrews, which has been highly praised by first-rate scholars. *Rural Evangelism*, by the Rev. Arthur Bennett, Vicar of Christ Church, Ware, and commended by Bishop Walter Carey, a thoughtful book on an urgent church problem (Mowbray; 2s. 6d. net); *And Hearts are Brave Again*, by Miss Winship Storey (Epworth Press; 6s. net), a book of encouragement and strength for the handicapped in life; *Mark These Men*, by the Rev. J. Sidlow Baxter, a well-known preacher in the Baptist Church. The book contains a series of Bible studies of notable figures, disguised under captions, like 'The Man Who Played the Fool' and 'The Man Who Routed the Aliens' (Marshall, Morgan and Scott; 9s. 6d. net); *One Crowded Hour*, a book of essays on religious themes by Mr. E. H. Hobday (Epworth Press; 6s. net). It is dedicated to a famous New Zealand preacher, Dr. Frank Boreham, and has much of the originality and felicity that made Dr. Boreham's books so widely popular; *Shaken Mists*, Essays on the Experience of God, by the Rev. James Mackay, which is very highly praised by Dr. Leslie Weatherhead. Mr. Mackay was so popular a preacher that long queues of young people waited for a considerable time to get into his church at Bournemouth (Skeffington; 5s. net); *Rise and Build*, by Mr. Douglas W. Thompson, which is described as a 'Chinese Pattern for Village Life' (Edinburgh House Press; 3s. 6d. net). The theme of the book is the rural Church of to-morrow in China. It begins with the first contact of the Church with Communism, and tells what Christian workers did to 'seize the day for God.' Under the guise of an imaginary village the book describes the application of principles which the Christian community had discovered for the reclamation of the ruined countryside. Part of the charm of this book is its description of the Chinese scene and people.

There are two books which contain addresses broadcast over the B.B.C. system. One is *Man and His Nature* (S.C.M. Press; 3s. 6d. net) in which are some talks on religion and philosophy designed to meet the needs of sixth form boys and girls in Secondary Grammar Schools, and to present for discussion the central affirmations of the Christian faith. There were three groups, one (the present) on 'Man and His Nature'; the others 'Man and His Conduct' and 'Man and His History.' The broadcasters included distinguished theologians like Professor H. H. Farmer and Professor C. H. Dodd and equally distinguished teachers. The series was launched by a talk on 'What is Man?' by the late William Paton. Then follow talks on 'Belief in God,' on 'God disclosing Himself,' on 'Personality in God and Man,' and on 'The Centre of Christian Experience.' This is a 'minor' book only in the sense that it is not physically large. In itself it is a book of very high importance. The second broadcast book is *From the Church in the Orchard* by the Rev. Eric Baker, M.A., Ph.D. (Epworth Press; 2s. net). It contains addresses delivered in the Light Programme at 11.30 a.m. on Sundays. They were directed not to church-goers but to other listeners. 'The Church in the Orchard' is in London and the addresses were given there first of all. The subjects are: 'A Happy New Year,' 'What is Man?' 'The Conquest of Time,' and 'The Church.'

Listen on Wednesday, by Mr. John G. Williams (S.C.M.; 5s. net), contains selections from 'Children's Hour Prayers.' They were broadcast every Wednesday at the end of Children's Hour. The talks are meant for young people over eleven and no attempt is made to 'talk down' to young people. The Christian faith is frankly argued in a fashion that most over-elevens will appreciate and understand. For the most part the Christian Year is followed, and opportunity is seized to deal with many problems (such as prayer) on which young people of this age really need and desire guidance. This is a delightful book. Two volumes of addresses to children by Professor Edgar P. Dickie of St. Andrews are again published—*One Year's Talks to Children* and *A Second Year's Talks to Children* (Hodder and Stoughton; 6s. net each). It is not necessary to do much more than mention these volumes, for Professor Dickie has already established his fame as a born speaker to children. It is probable that the substance of these talks will be reproduced in many pulpits. And this is probably the author's own desire. The late Professor H. R. Mackintosh was quoted as saying that the only things he cribbed were children's sermons. Well, here is a large field for justifiable plagiarism.

The Raising of Lazarus.

By the Reverend E. Kenneth Lee, M.A., M.Litt., Vicar of Lofthouse, near Wakefield.

In this article I propose to examine two phrases in the Johannine account of the Raising of Lazarus and the special interpretation which the Fourth Evangelist gave to them.

1. Jn 11^{33}, *ἐτάραξεν ἑαυτόν*. This expression, unique in the Bible amid frequent uses of the passive 'to be troubled,' seems intended to have a special meaning. It will be best appreciated by examining, first, the ancient Messianic uses of the phrase in the passive; then, any Synoptic passages that bear on them; lastly, the Johannine use of the word.

The Psalms abound with passages in which the Psalmist cries, 'My heart, or soul, is troubled (*ἐταράχθη*).' But it is only in Pss 42 and 43 that the words come as a refrain twice repeated. 'Why art thou full of grief, O my soul (*περίλυπος εἶ, ἡ ψυχή μου*), and why dost thou fill me with trouble (*συνταράσσεις*)?' Compare Ps 42^{6}: 'My soul is troubled within me (*πρὸς ἐμαυτὸν ἡ ψυχή μου ἐταράχθη*).'

This word 'full of grief' is found only here in the canonical Old Testament. In the New Testament also it is very rare, but Jesus is represented as using it before His thrice repeated prayer in Gethsemane (Mk 14^{34}, Mt 26^{38}), 'My soul is full of grief (*Περίλυπός ἐστιν ἡ ψυχή μου*) even unto death.' Luke omits these words, possibly for the same reason for which he omits the words given by Mark and Matthew (Mk 15^{34}, Mt 27^{46}), 'Why hast thou forsaken me?'

Now, from the analogy of many instances, we may anticipate that what the Third Gospel thus omits the Fourth will insert, but in some quite new shape that shall bring out its latent spiritual meaning. In the place of the cry 'My God, my God, why hast thou forsaken me?' it substitutes —probably from a Psalm with a somewhat similar beginning (63^{1}, , God, my God, or, God is my God . . . my soul thirsteth for Thee')—'I thirst,' as though Christ's meaning were, not that He reproached the Father for absence, but that He longed for the Father's immediate presence. So here, what the first two Gospels express by 'full of grief' (from Ps 42^{6}) the Fourth Gospel expresses by a word (*ταράσσειν*) almost identical with that found in the same sentence of the same Psalm (*συνταράσσειν*). No other author in the New Testament uses the word 'to be troubled' except of timorousness, or the fears of distrust, or the doubts of a bad conscience, or the confused alarms of a mob; and this very author represents Jesus as saying to the disciples (14^{1}), 'Let not your heart be troubled.' Yet here, not content with speaking of Christ's 'heart' or 'soul,' he represents Christ Himself as subjected to 'trouble.'

Is the difficulty increased or diminished by the peculiar form of the expression, 'He troubled Himself'? At first sight, it may seem increased; for the phrase seems fatal to the genuineness of the 'trouble.' And so it would be if it were literally taken, apart from ancient traditions and controversies. But we have to bear in mind that the Psalm represents a dialogue between the Psalmist and his soul, in which the latter is, as it were, personified and remonstrated with on its action. 'Why art thou so disquieted within me?' says the Hebrew: and the Greek is still stronger, 'Why dost thou fill me with trouble?'—as though the 'soul' were conflicting with the man. Now we learn from Origen (*Cels.*, ii. 9) that such passages as those quoted above from the Synoptists were used by antagonists for the purpose of decrying Jesus; and Origen protests against the supposition that Christians believe either the soul or the body of Jesus to be God—'the soul about which is uttered the saying, "My soul is *full of grief*."' What Origen thus protests negatively, our Evangelist seems to be protesting positively, namely, that the Being whom we worship as Divine is One in whom there is no conflict between the Divine and the human. He asserts, not that Christ's 'trouble' was unreal, but that He spontaneously took the trouble into Himself, in harmonious obedience to the will of the Father and to the dictates of His own love for man. So far from artificially rousing the mere semblance of 'trouble,' the Divine Nature—knowing sin in contrast to perfect righteousness—was capable of feeling infinitely keener 'trouble' than imperfect humanity can feel. But, with all its keenness, it was voluntary. He was the Son, and one with the Father in act and will. What the Father did, the Son did. The Father 'troubled' the Son? Then the Son 'troubled' Himself.

Another motive also could hardly fail to be in the author's mind—a desire to correct the prevalent Stoic teaching about 'trouble.' The fundamental precept in the *Encheiridion* is 'Be free from trouble (*ἀτάραχος*).' 'Troubles,' the author tells us (*Ench.*, 5), 'arise not from facts but from fancies.' No one ought to be ever troubled (*ταράσσεσθαι*). A man may be allowed to pretend to be troubled and grieved out of sympathy with others; just

as one may pretend in playing games with children. But to be really troubled is foolish and wrong and faithless. Such sayings are scattered broadcast over the *Lectures* of Epictetus.

There was truth in this doctrine, and it accords, as we have seen, with the words of Jesus. To be 'troubled,' in a sense, is to be unbelieving: 'Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it play the coward. Ye believe in God? Believe also in Me' (Jn 14^{1}). No man who perfectly 'believed' in Jesus could ever be so 'troubled' as to disturb the fundamental peace on which his spiritual life was based. But, on the other hand, there are possibilities of what may be called surface-trouble, yet trouble sincere and painful, for all those who recognize—what Epictetus did not recognize—that there is a devil as well as a God, and that God Himself is to be regarded as fighting against evil, and (in the person of His Son) suffering in the conflict. Because St. Paul felt this 'trouble,' he became a living power and drew multitudes to Christ through himself; because Epictetus did not feel it, he remained, comparatively speaking, a passive monument of the nobility of patience.

It is the object of the Fourth Evangelist to show that, if at any time the Logos gave up the calm, or *ataraxia*, on which philosophers set so high a price, it was, in the first place, in conformity with the Divine laws of the Universe—just as the wind, blowing on the waters, keeps them sweet and pure, or as God's Wind (Breath or Spirit) moved on the abysmal water in the beginning in order to impart the harmony of the spiritual life; and in the next place, he was thus 'troubled,' not for himself, but for the human race. Out of this 'trouble'—as in the beginning, so now—there sprang words of Creation—in Genesis, 'Let there be light,' and there was light, light out of darkness, and order out of chaos; in the Gospel, 'Lazarus, hither, forth' and man came forth, bound hand and foot, but living, and delivered from the cave of death.

The Divine mystery of the 'trouble' of the Logos is thrice mentioned, and it ends in a climax. Here the Logos troubles the Logos. Presently we shall find the Logos 'troubled' in '*soul*' (12^{27}). Last of all He is 'troubled in *spirit*' (13^{21}).

2. Jn 11^{43}, ἐκραύγασεν. The word κραυγάζειν (six times used in the Fourth Gospel), 'cry aloud,' 'clamour,' 'shriek,' occurs in the New Testament (apart from Ac 22^{23} of a crowd 'clamouring') only in Mt 12^{19}, quoting from Is 42^{2} concerning the Messiah, 'He shall not cry aloud (κραυγάσει) (LXX. κεκράξεται).' The prophecy continues: '. . . He shall bring forth judgement in truth. He shall not fail nor be discouraged, till he have set judgement on the earth.'

Matthew is apparently dissatisfied with the LXX. translation. How could it be denied that the Messiah did 'cry' (Mt 27^{50}, κράξας) on the Cross? There were three ways of removing the difficulty. (1) The word κεκράξεται being retained, it might be argued that the 'crying aloud' did not take place till Christ's death, when He *had* brought forth judgment to victory; so that κράξας in Mt 27^{50} was justifiable. Or (2) κεκράξεται might be changed, *e.g.*, into κραυγάσει, 'shriek,' or 'clamour'; and this, it might be said, Christ never did. Or (3) the Evangelist might avoid using the word κραζειν altogether concerning Christ. Mark and Luke adopt this course; Matthew adopts the second. The Fourth Gospel ($7^{28.\ 37}$ 12^{44}) records that Christ on three occasions 'cried' (ἔκραξε), but that, on this single occasion, He 'cried aloud' (ἐκραύγασε), *i.e.*, with a sound of the nature of a clamour or cry of distress. This is all the more noteworthy because John subsequently uses the latter almost non-Biblical term (12^{13} 18^{40} $19^{6.\ 12.\ 15}$) to denote the outcry of a crowd, in the first instance applauding Jesus, in the rest seeking His death. Why does he apply to Jesus on this single occasion a word so apparently unsuitable, applied to Him by no other Evangelist, and expressly disavowed by the first of the three?

The answer extends beyond the verbal dissimilarity between the Synoptists and the Fourth Evangelist. It affects their several conceptions of Christ's last moments. Although Matthew alone uses κράζειν of Jesus on the Cross, yet the three Synoptists agree that Jesus cried with 'a loud utterance' (φωνῇ μεγάλῃ) (Mk 15^{37}, Mt 27^{50}, Lk 23^{46}). John, on the other hand, uses simply (19^{26-30}) 'say' (λέγει, εἶπεν) of the last two utterances of Jesus, while he selects, as the single occasion for a 'loud utterance' (φωνὴ μεγάλη) on the part of Jesus, the moment now under consideration, when He is figuratively rescuing mankind from death, and 'bringing forth judgement unto victory.' Having regard to the remarkable rarity of κραυγάζειν in the Bible, and to our Evangelist's necessary acquaintance with the quotation in Matthew and with the controversies that were sure to arise out of it, we seem safe in concluding that he had these controversies in mind when writing this description of a supreme Messianic 'sign' in which every step was to be the fulfilment of some type or prediction.

But at the same time a deeper thought is revealed in the frequency with which he subsequently applies the word to the multitude, only once 'shouting' or 'screaming' for the Messiah, four times 'shouting' or 'screaming' against Him. It is essentially a word of weakness, often indicating passion and want of self-control. The author appears to suggest that, on the single occasion when the Redeemer allowed Himself to overpass the calm that characterized His utter-

ances, it was not in any cry uttered for Himself on the Cross, but when He was crying aloud for Lazarus 'bound hand and foot,' for Lazarus whom He 'loved,' and therein for the world which He came to save. The Apocalypse had taught that from the New Jerusalem God would banish 'every tear' and all 'crying' (κραυγή) (Rev 21^4). This Gospel carries us a step further. Before that consummation could arrive, the Messiah Himself must pour forth 'tears' (11^{35}, ἐδάκρυσεν) and to utter 'crying.' But how this great truth was liable to misunderstanding may be gathered from the Epistle to the Hebrews, which asserts that the Messiah 'offered up prayers and supplications with strong crying and tears (κραυγῆς καὶ δακρύων) unto him that was able to save him from death' (5^7). Whatever truth there may have been in the supposition that Christ so identified Himself with the sinful world that He entertained in His mind (not as a doubt of His own, but as a Satanic thought to be wrestled with and overthrown) the possibility that He, too, together with those whom He had come to save, might not be saved from 'the last enemy of all'—the Evangelist felt that at least it must be erroneous to impute to the Saviour, in His deepest sufferings, a self-regarding attitude. Such an imputation he contradicts here. There were indeed 'tears,' there was indeed 'crying aloud'; but they were not for Himself. On the Cross there was no crying and no tears, nothing but quiet 'saying,' indicative of thought for others ('woman, behold thy Son'), or of an absorbing thirst for the Father's presence ('I thirst'), or of a delight in having accomplished His will ('It is finished'). But what Christ could not do for Himself, He could do for sinful mankind. There was a truth in the mocking reproach of the Pharisees, 'He saved others, himself he could not save.' So here, if He could not weep and cry aloud for Himself, He could for Lazarus and for all mankind for whom Lazarus' condition was symbolical.

In the Study.

Virginibus Puerisque.

The Door.

By the Reverend Fergus Ferguson, O.B.E., B.D., Perth.

'I am the door.'—Jn 10^9.

What a lot of doors there are in the world, all sorts and sizes and shapes of doors—house doors, school doors, church doors, shop doors—and they all like to have people passing in and out of them. Many doors invite you to go in at them. You discover that when you go shopping. If you listen carefully as you walk along a street that is full of shops you may hear each door, as you pass it, inviting you to come in. 'Come in,' the door calls to you. 'Come right in. You will find lots of things to buy in here.' Yes, but though the shop may be full of things to buy, it may not have the one thing you want. You will never get the thing you want until you find the shop that has it, and go in at the door of *that* shop. For example. If you want very much to buy a model aeroplane, or a pair of skates for the ice-rink, you don't go in at the door of a hairdresser to ask for them. You won't get them there. That is the wrong door to go in at.

So you must always be careful to go in at the right door. If you want a loaf of bread go in at the door of a baker's shop. He is the right person to go to. He bakes loaves of bread, and when you ask one from him he can give it to you. If what you want is to learn to read and write you go in at the door of a school, for you know that inside that door you will find the teachers who can teach you these things.

Now Jesus says to each one of us, 'If you wish to learn the most important thing of all, the right way to live your life so that you will grow up to be a useful, happy man or woman, you must come to Me. Learn of Me. It is through Me you learn the true way to live life.' Or if you wish to live your life with God as your friend, it is through Jesus that you and God become friends. And if you wish to have your life saved from the things that waste and spoil it, like the temptation to do wrong, or bad temper or selfishness, or revenge, you must go to Jesus. He is the right Person to go to. He says, 'I am the door: by me if any man enter in, he shall be saved.'

I remember the door of the Latin class-room at Glasgow University. If you were a minute late for the class, and came up to the door expecting to get in, you found the door locked and you were shut out. That door did not say to you, 'Come in.' It said, 'You come too late. The door is shut. You cannot enter now.'

But Jesus never shuts the door against any one. He says, 'I am the door. Whosoever cometh unto Me I shall in no wise cast out.' He keeps it always

open for us, so that whenever we come to Him, we find the door open. And He allows nobody else to shut it against us. For He speaks again to us and says, 'I have set before thee an open door, and no man can shut it.'

We go through hundreds of doors to get the things we want in life. Let us make sure that we go in at the door Jesus keeps open for us, that we may have the precious blessings He alone can give us.

Diversity Reception.

By the Reverend John Garfoot, B.A., Westgate, near Bishop Auckland.

'There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit . . . diversities of ministrations, and the same Lord . . . diversities of workings, but the same God.'—1 Co 12^{4-6} (R.V.).

If one is wireless-minded at all, there is always something of a thrill about 'getting' America or some very distant place (it doesn't seem so long ago since picking up any foreign station was regarded as a triumph). I can never resist seeing what I can find on the short waveband if I happen to be up later than usual at night. Sometimes, even on my little set, I have managed to hear a little bit of a programme from the other side of the Atlantic, but never very much before it has faded. I had often wondered how the B.B.C. manages occasionally to relay an important Broadcast from, say, New York. The answer was given in a recent Radio Newsreel Bulletin. At a lonely spot called Tatsfield on the North Downs they have a special receiving station where Broadcasts are listened to from all over the world. And when there is the likelihood of fading they are received, not on one set but on more, with aerials placed some distance apart and at different angles. In this way, the technicians have discovered a more complete reception may be obtained, for fading rarely occurs at the same time on two receivers. 'Diversity reception' it is called.

I wonder how many boys and girls have been puzzled and even rather worried about the number of different denominations there are. On the way to your own place of worship maybe you pass by several other churches. You don't know much about them and ask why it is that there should be Anglicans, Methodists, Presbyterians, and so on. The answer is a long story. Sometimes in the past there have been quarrels and jealousies which have led to the formation of new denominations. In most cases the split away from a parent church has been because earnest men have seen in the church of their day something they have sincerely believed was wrong, and when the opportunity of putting it right has been denied them, they have felt compelled to form a new branch of the Church. So we have really inherited these divisions. In our day many great church leaders are doing all they can to bring all the Christian churches together. But that does not mean that we shall all go under the same denominational label, all worship in just the same manner, all listen to the same kind of sermons. While men and women have different outlooks, different points of view, different needs, we shall never be ready for that. Would people who find great inspiration in a cathedral service, for instance, find the same blessing in a mission-hall—and vice versa, of course? As there has been within the Methodist Church, unions of other like-minded denominations may come about in the future, but in our time we must expect to see different branches of the Church still functioning in their own way, though all of them still belonging to the world-wide Church of Christ, rather like the different regiments of one mighty army. The important thing is that we should regard each other in this way. It's 'diversity reception'—we are each able to make some contribution, and often a stronger one just at that point where the church across the way is weaker. And where we 'fade out' we should be glad to listen where others can speak with a more confident voice. So that by our combined efforts God's Word and the truth which He sends out to mankind through His Church can be heard plainly and unmistakably.

The Christian Year.

Second Sunday in Lent.

Faith.

By the Reverend John R. Gray, B.D., Glasgow.

'What must I do to be saved? . . . Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ.'—Ac $16^{30.31}$.

1. The keeper of the prison had undergone a profoundly moving experience. He had been the witness of a miracle—the bursting open of the prison gates—none the less miraculous for having a natural explanation in the earthquake. Such experiences of the remarkable in Nature have often been the turning point in men's lives. It is indeed arguable that every life lacks depth and maturity until the soul has stood on the brink of eternity or tragedy and peered awestruck over the chasm. Luther's first step on the road to the Reformation came, it is said, when a companion was struck dead by lightning at his side. Dr. Peter Marshall, who wielded such enormous influence as minister of New York Avenue Church in Washington, testified that from the day when he was stopped at the edge of a cliff when walking in a fog, he was convinced that God had a purpose

for him to fulfil. Once, during the War, I boarded one of H.M. ships newly returned to base after having been torpedoed. The torpedo had hit the ship fairly, but forward at what was almost the only safe point in her hull. Not a single member of her ship's company had been injured. I was greeted by her Commander who said, 'You're on a good wicket to-day, Chaplain. There's not an atheist on board after that hit.' Undoubtedly God has used and does use apparent accidents, escapes, and natural phenomena to bring the careless to their senses, to reveal to them not only the eternity towards which they journey but His own gracious power to save.

2. It was not, however, the first miracle that convinced the keeper of the prison. It was the second. Supposing his prisoners to be escaped, he was about to take his life. Well he knew that dismissal and disgrace, if not death, would be his lot for allowing prisoners as important as Paul and Silas to escape. The second miracle became apparent when Paul bade him do himself no harm as they were all present. The first miracle the sceptic in him could have explained away as due to chance. But no chance could explain the refusal of prisoners to escape. Here was behaviour so utterly contrary to his experience and expectations that he could hardly credit his ears. Here was something so distinctively new as to bring him to his knees. These men must have a secret so far denied to him, must have *the* secret. These two whom he had thrust into the stocks in the inner prison had saved him—not only his life but his honour and reputation. They had in a few hours gained such influence over their fellow-prisoners as to have restrained them too from 'taking the chance.' No gospel of which the keeper had heard could produce such self-restraint, such power to forgive. It was this—the behaviour of Paul and Silas—that made him feel that God was not far away. So is it still. God gains His entry into the hearts of men not so much by miracles of Nature as by miracles of personality. He moves the audience not by stage effects but by the character of the actors. Most of us looking back on our lives would be ready to acknowledge that we have been chiefly moulded not by things or movements but by people—parents, teachers, friends, wives, or husbands. Yes, and by children. To judge from what He left behind Christ trusted for the victory of His gospel not to an organization or to a book but to the influence of consecrated men and women. It is as men take knowledge of us that we have been with Him that they will be drawn—as was the keeper of the prison—to give glory unto God. What is the next step?

3. Here is the last surprise for the keeper. It is the Apostle's reply. 'What must I do to be saved?,' he cried. Quite certainly he expected to be confronted with some difficult demand. Other religions there were with mysterious rites—baths in bulls' blood and so on. Surely a faith so strangely powerful as this must have some strange features. The very question, of course, is redolent with Atheism. 'What must *I do* to be saved?' If something 'I' can 'do' can save me, I don't need saving at all. In the question is all the proud presumption of the man who would be his own saviour. When in 1505 Luther entered the convent of the Augustinian Eremites, his avowed intent was to save his soul. He fasted and scourged himself; he tried every sort of asceticism; but all to no purpose. He had no peace till God said to him, 'the just shall live by faith' and he knew the personal trust in the Saviour in which faith consists.

Not different is Paul's reply to the gaoler, 'Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved.' What must I do? Believe! The answer seems to be a *non sequitur*, a refusal to answer the question. So it is, for to the keeper's question there is no answer. There is nothing *I* can *do* to be saved. There is nothing for it but to trust in the all-sufficient, redeeming work of Christ.

When more than in our day of triumphant science and restless activism was this ever-old, ever-new truth of justification by faith alone so sorely needed? A Professor of Medicine once said that more people were killed by their friends than by their enemies. He was attacking the too ready recourse to 'cures,' to specifics of one kind and another which either aggravate the illness or give rise to another. So too is it with the nation and the world. We cannot keep our restless hands from perpetually tinkering with the ills our tinkering has caused. When things get beyond us our cry is, 'Why doesn't some one *do* something?' Some One has. Life is too much for us to live alone. Left to ourselves we strive and blunder, growing hot and flustered, and accomplish nothing. It is only when we turn first to God for guidance and wisdom, for light on life's road and power to live it that anything we do has lasting usefulness or value.

It is as simple as that. Just put out your hand and His is there, strong and kind and sure; and the fearfulness is gone from life and the fretfulness and the fever. It is easy to fall into the error of believing that we can save the world through Christ, and not Christ through us. As we face the mass of evil about us or within, it is easy to imagine that there must be *something* we can do—and rush off and do it! But all our effort and all our striving, all our self-sacrifice will be thrown away unless first we are subjected to the will of God and empowered by His grace.

Not the disciple who drew the sword in the Garden but the Christ who submitted to the Father's will, did the work of God. It is as we turn to that same Christ in humble trust and utter dependence that His marvellous work shall be done in the world, for it is only then that His marvellous work can begin in our own poor hearts. 'What must I do to be saved? . . . Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.'

THIRD SUNDAY IN LENT.

The Last Time.

BY THE REVEREND STEWART MECHIE, M.A., EDINBURGH.

'Little children, it is the last time: and as ye have heard that antichrist shall come, even now are there many antichrists; whereby we know that it is the last time.'—1 Jn 2^{18}.

It was not the last time. The end of the world did not come then, nor has it come even now. But that is not to say that there is nothing for us in this text.

Let us try to picture the situation of the Christian Church in Asia Minor in the last years of the first century of our era. The Church was still a small and unpopular minority in the community. For the moment there was apparently no active persecution; but the Church, which in one locality and another had suffered at the hands of the Emperors Nero and Domitian, knew what persecution meant, and might well expect it to break out again. It was not, however, the hostile Roman Empire which to the writer of this letter appeared as antichrist. In his view antichrist came right out of the very heart of the Church itself. It was deadly heresy that was antichrist. In this letter the author speaks of a group of Christian teachers who had gone astray in doctrine and perhaps also in conduct. 'False prophets,' he calls them. As prophets, they must have been persons commanding respect and exercising authority in the Church. Perhaps they were over-anxious to accommodate the message of the gospel to what in their day passed for 'modern thought,' and in their anxiety abandoned what was essential to Christian truth. They perverted, it seems, the doctrine of the Incarnation by denying that the Son of God had come in the flesh. Failing to carry the whole Church with them in this respect, they seceded from it and continued their activity in the pagan community around; and there apparently they found a considerable response, indeed a larger response than the orthodox teachers of the Church could command.

These false teachers are the 'many antichrists' mentioned in our text, but behind them lurks the real antichrist which excites our author's alarm—not a person, but a poisonous doctrine, perverting the truth of the gospel and corrupting the minds and eventually the morals of men. Humanly speaking, the situation seems hopeless. The world is hostile, the fellowship of the Church is shattered by heresy and schism, the false teachers are making more headway than the true. Things have got beyond all the resources of human wisdom and virtue. All that remains is to fall back upon God. Surely the end of the world is at hand. Now, when the situation is hopeless on the human plane, the Lord will come again and roll up the scroll of time and bring the Kingdom in fullness of power. 'It is the last time.' That is the confidence which saves our author from despair.

There are those who see the Church in the world to-day in much the same hopeless situation as this writer saw the Church in Asia Minor at the very end of the first century. In the world as a whole the Church is still a minority, in many parts a very small minority. It is often unpopular and sometimes persecuted. Moreover, in Marxian Communism it has a competitor, seemingly in this generation more successful than itself. Perhaps the parallel with the first century could be carried further. Marxian Communism is a post-Christian doctrine. It is a secularized version of Christianity. It presents the Christian hope with God and the hereafter cut out. It is, in short, a perversion of the truth of the gospel, a Christian heresy, or, to use our author's word, antichrist.

Not only so, but there are some Christians to-day who would follow the ancient writer and hold that, since these things are so, since there is such a concentration of the powers of evil that the situation seems hopeless, the final coming of the Lord must be very nigh. It may be so; or it may not, as it certainly was not at the end of the first century when this letter was written. Such situations have recurred again and again in the history of the Church from that time to this, and the type of them all is that crucial last time which saw the Crucifixion of the Son of God. Then it seemed as if the day was lost for God and goodness. Could there be any more hopeless situation than that presented by the first Good Friday? The Chosen People of God reject their Messiah, His disciples forsake Him and flee, the Son of God goes down to death, the powers of evil are victorious. The case is utterly hopeless—but for God. The victory is really His. The Resurrection comes to make that clear; and soon the Church, indwelt by the Spirit of the Risen and Exalted Lord, is launched upon its conquering career. That is the type of all those last times which have recurred in the history of the Church, times when everything seems hopeless,

when everything *is* hopeless, apart from God. Our writer thought it meant literally that the world was just at an end. That was an illusion in his day, though one day it will not be an illusion. It was not then the last time, it was a last time, similar in nature to the many other last times of which the type is the first Good Friday.

What, then, are we of the Church to do in such a hopeless time as this in which our lot is cast? Why, precisely what the Church at the end of the first century did in its hopeless situation, its last time.

First, let us hold fast to the truth of the gospel. 'Let that therefore abide in you, which ye have heard from the beginning,' says our author, and he closes his letter with the words, 'Little children, keep yourselves from idols.' By that he means not idols of wood and stone but idols of the mind—false ideologies, as we would say. That is our first duty—to hold fast the gospel of the Word made flesh, the Son of God incarnate, crucified, risen, and exalted.

Second, let us witness to and propagate this gospel. The false doctrine in that age might have greater immediate success, the very end of the world might seem at hand, but the Church did not, on that account, give up its active work. It persevered with its witness and propaganda and, though the struggle took generations, the day came when the Gnostic sects derived from the false teachers were gone, out-lived, out-died, and out-thought by the Church. Whether with much immediate success or not, whether this may be the absolute last time or not, we too must continue our Christian witness, obeying our marching orders, 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the gospel to every creature.'

Lastly, let us trust in God and His exalted Son our Saviour. The characteristic of a last time, whether at the end of the first century or in the middle of the twentieth century is that all is hopeless, apart from God; all is lost, were it not that Christ is at the right hand of God, principalities and powers being subject unto Him. Assured of that, the Church can hold fast the truth of the gospel and witness to and propagate the gospel, whether the time be a last time or the last time. But do we really believe that? Do we believe it as the Christians of Asia Minor believed it some fifty or sixty years after our text was written? Let us see how they believed it. At Smyrna, in the amphitheatre, Polycarp, an aged bishop and beloved Christian leader, was martyred because he would not deny his Lord. It was a heavy blow to the Church, but not a shattering blow; for, despite all, faith remained bright and strong. Shortly afterwards the Church in Smyrna wrote an account of it and this is how the martyrdom of Polycarp is dated: 'Statius Quadratus being proconsul, but Jesus Christ being King for ever.' That is the faith for a last time.

FOURTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

Freedom.

BY THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL H. F. LOVELL COCKS, M.A., D.D., BRISTOL.

'Jesus therefore said to those Jews which had believed him, If ye abide in my word, then are ye truly my disciples; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free.'—Jn $8^{31f.}$ (R.V.).

These Jews were not yet disciples. They believed Jesus; they did not yet believe on Him. His personality had impressed them, and they approved His teaching. But their approval meant little and committed them to nothing. Truth for them was something still formal, attaching to propositions of theology or ethics—abstract and remote from life. And the sequel showed that their agreement with Jesus was merely superficial, and their understanding of Him a misunderstanding. Their cherished prejudices were too strong for them, and they ended by rejecting Him and His claim. Yet it need not have been so. Jesus tells them that in believing what He says they have taken the first step on the way that would lead them to full faith in Him. Only let them recognize that truth must be acted on as well as believed, and they will prove themselves genuine learners, real disciples. And then they will be led into a deeper, more intimate knowledge of the Truth, and into the freedom such knowledge brings with it.

But when Jesus promised them freedom they took offence. 'We do not need to be set free,' they proudly replied, 'we are free already.' They point to their descent from Abraham as evidence that they are free-born, and in bondage to no man. They were thinking of freedom as an external status—freedom before the Law, and the possession of rights and privileges publicly acknowledged. But Jesus was speaking of a more radical freedom—liberation from the inner bondage of the human spirit to error and sin.

The strident gospels of our time all proclaim liberty. Totalitarian gospels proclaim it. Hitler was able to rally Germany by his promise that he would undo the injustice and humiliation of the Versailles Treaty and lead the nation into an ampler 'living space' and a new era of progress and prosperity. Marxist Communism summons the workers to unite in a revolution in which they have nothing to lose but their chains. And the democratic opponents of Totalitarianism advance

the same standard of liberty and come forward as champions of the fundamental rights of man. Scientific humanism promises us freedom in the name of science which, it is claimed, can liberate man from bondage to his natural environment and open the way to unimaginable well-being. And amid this modern diversity of tongues, the Christian gospel promises liberty too. For Jesus came, as He said, 'to preach deliverance to the captives, and recovering of sight to the blind, to set at liberty them that are bruised.' But the emancipation Christ offers is far more thoroughgoing than any offered by the current ideologies. It is freedom through knowledge of the Truth.

Yes, the Truth—the whole truth. For a half truth can bind us more fast than ignorance itself. And it is half truths that we are being offered to-day. Indeed, that is what an ideology is—a half truth offered and believed in as the whole of truth. Thus every deviation from the Communist party line is branded as bourgeois heresy. Intolerance of criticism and the suppression of free expression of opinion are not the marks of the truth that liberates but of the half truth that enslaves. God is the God of Truth, but the half truth is an idol whose worship degrades the spirit of man.

This is true, not only of the totalitarian creeds but of scientific humanism as well. The disinterested, self-effacing devotion of the scientific researcher bears witness to man's need of truth. Yet scientific truth is not the Truth that liberates him. Science equips man with new powers. But unless man is freed from his inner bondage to greed, envy, pride, and the lust of domination, he will use these powers to destroy himself. We need more than the scientist can give us to break this captivity of the soul. Our science can teach us more effective ways of killing our enemies, but it cannot release us from our burden of hate and fear, or change our enmity into friendship. It can give us an external freedom. It can release us from toilsome drudgery and the menace of famine; it can make our bodies healthier and cushion our human existence against the roughness of Nature. It can do much to change our physical environment. But it cannot change *us*. It can strike off the chains that fetter our limbs, but it cannot rid our minds of malignant delusions or transform our selfishness into faith and love.

Man is a creature of contradictions. He desires the truth—and this is the source of his science and technology. Yet he also desires not to know the truth—and this is the source of his delusions, his idolatries, and his inhumanities. The truth he will not face is the truth about himself. He will not, dare not, admit that he is a sinner. He claims that he is free, and will not face the grim fact of his bondage. Modern psychology has made us familiar with 'repression' and 'complexes.' Rather than face the ugly facts that seem to give the lie to the fair picture we have painted of ourselves, we repress the truth and will not let it emerge into our daylight consciousness. So long as we do this we are mentally sick.

So, on a deeper level than that with which the psychiatrist can deal, does man 'hold down the truth in unrighteousness.' And Paul tells us that we will not face the truth about ourselves because we will not face the truth about God. Our sin is just our refusal to acknowledge God as the Lord, to whom we owe worship and obedience. And turning our backs on God, we make for ourselves idols and worship them. Refusing the Truth, we fall a prey to delusions and lies. Claiming to be free, we sell ourselves into slavery.

When, therefore, Christ comes to us with His gracious invitation we encounter Him with divided minds. Since God has created us to find the Truth and live by it, like these Jews in our text we recognize truth in the words of Jesus. But because we are sinners, who hate and fear nothing more than the truth about ourselves, we try to evade His challenge. We praise the sermon, but apply it to the man in the next pew or to the outsider in the street. But when by God's grace we see Christ as Truth incarnate, we no longer do this or desire to do it. We acknowledge ourselves to be proud sinners who stand in need of God's forgiveness, and we come to know God as the loving Saviour who reconciles us to Himself, giving us the deliverance we could never earn. And so we begin life anew, in repentance and humility, content to obey Christ and walk in His way. And then we are free indeed.

We have freedom of worship; for we know God and have confidence in His presence. There is an external freedom of worship—security against arbitrary human authority that would prohibit our worship or dictate its form. But precious as this is, the inner freedom is more precious still—when we are set free to worship, not because a despotic deity demands this at our hands, but because our hearts overflow with gratitude to a holy God who has loved us sinners and called us into fellowship with Himself. And there are other freedoms too within this Divine enfranchisement. Though the world is still darkened by sin and menaced by catastrophes, we know that it is God's world, and that nothing can pluck us out of His hand. And we are set free to love and serve our neighbour—a thing we can never do with a sincere mind so long as we think we have to earn our salvation by 'good works.' To us is given

> A heart at leisure from itself,
> To soothe and sympathize.

We are free—truly free. For we have found our Master—that gracious Lord whose service is perfect freedom.

FIFTH SUNDAY IN LENT.

Gethsemane.

BY THE REVEREND T. E. MORRIS, HUCKNALL, NOTTINGHAM.

'And they came to a place which was named Gethsemane: and he saith to his disciples, Sit ye here, while I shall pray.'—Mk 14^{32}.

With the dread drama of crucifixion only a short time later, the more intense experience of Gethsemane is often given but passing notice. There are comparatively few hymns about the scene in the Garden. This is not surprising, for what took place there was a personal and private experience which could not be shared fully with any other. This, in part, is the reason why the public event of crucifixion has overshadowed the intense experience of Gethsemane. Another aspect of the matter is also fairly clear. We feel more readily in our flesh than in our soul. Cruelty fascinates, but personal anguish brings forth only an awkward 'I am sorry.'

The experience in the Garden of Gethsemane is as objectively real as the physical agony on Calvary. It is no less real in being such an intensely personal event. It may not be regarded as a truce between hostility and the final onslaught. Rather, it is an act of final dedication on the part of Jesus. In a sense, crucifixion took place in Gethsemane before its physical enactment on Calvary. The Cross would not have been quite so significant had there been no such act of personal dedication.

From one aspect, the Crucifixion of Jesus would, of course, have been cause for regret that a good man had been shamefully and unjustly punished; from the other aspect, it would have been regarded (as it was) as the inevitable end of a disturber. (I did) 'the best I could for Israel,' was the comment of Caiaphas in Miss Dorothy Sayers' drama, *The Man Born to be King*.

Looking at Calvary—through Gethsemane—we know that even 'the light of sacred story' cannot do justice to its sublimity. To look at Calvary from some other angle, while passing by Gethsemane, is to do an injustice to Christ, and to miss the deeper meaning, as we have seen. The Cross, in itself, is not sublime. It is but the ugly instrument of capital punishment. Nothing can make an instrument of destruction lovely. The stake and the fire are not lovely, or inspiring to look at, but they are invested with glory through the utterance of Hugh Latimer, 'Be of good courage, Master Ridley. . . .' What makes the Cross sublime is the prior sublimity that we see in Gethsemane.

This glory cannot be uttered. It can only be suggested. Sidney Lanier's moving hymn—

> Into the woods my Master went,
> Clean forspent, forspent . . .

opens for us a casement on the scene. The rest is but dumb acknowledgment of the majestically humble spirit of Jesus Christ.

Even the narrative of Gethsemane is broken. By the very nature of the experience it cannot be more complete as a written account. Possibly we do not allow ourselves time enough to read it. Mark's account, with its restraint, shorn of all imaginative detail, is very telling. If Mark was the 'certain young man, having a linen cloth cast about his naked body,' as described in *v.* 51, it is likely that he was the only observer of the scene. The three disciples were too distressed to be closely observant. An overwrought mind is not the most receptive. Even they, however, could not have given a clearer picture.

The simplicity of the narrative veils three long periods of silence. They are phases of the final communion of Jesus with the Father. Here, description is inadequate, and comment inopportune. We can only meditate, entering sympathetically and reverently into that sacred realm.

1. The first phase in this communion is *the silence of conflict.* There is no mention of it, but it comes immediately after *v.* 36, and before the following verse. The brief prayer of *v.* 36 takes only seven or eight seconds to utter, but who can plumb the depth of that intimate communion with the Father? And who can measure the intensity of the spiritual conflict?

If indeed Mark was the only alert beholder of the scene, he could only wait until something else happened. One may attempt to describe silence, but only by sensing something deeper than the silence. During that time, how often his eyes strayed from the quivering figure of Jesus to the recumbent, though uneasy, figures of the three disciples, then back again to the Master, so that he should miss no little movement in this private event! Then, at last, this phase of communion was punctuated with a prayer. Did it come before the silence, or at its close? Or, maybe, it was uttered several times! And then, going to the disciples, Jesus 'findeth them sleeping.'

The intensely personal events of life are always robed in silence. The lover's vow is quietly whispered before the public recognition of it; the soldier's acceptance of his order is often but a salute—before the fray. Again, no one will ever know the tumult that preceded the words spoken

by Edith Cavell: 'Standing as I do in view of God and eternity, I realize that patriotism is not enough. I must have no hatred or bitterness toward any one.'

2. After this phase of communion comes *the silence of consent.* In a sense it does an injustice to the matter to divide an act of communion into phases, for in it there is

a sense sublime
Of something far more deeply interfused.

It is the intellect that takes up little parts of an experience that is fused into an *eternal now.*

Communion with God, nevertheless, inevitably sets up a conflict between that which is eternally significant and the lesser visions we hold. Then comes consent. The Father called; the manhood of the Master responded, 'not what I will, but what thou wilt.'

The second period of silence comes after *v.* 39. Mark says, 'Again he went away, and prayed, and spake the same words,' and after the quietness, not so intense now with inner conflict, Jesus returned to the disciples. Not a word of reproof came from Him. He did not ask, as before, 'Couldest not thou watch one hour?' Consent had stilled, in part, the quailing flesh, and consent is the acceptance of a destiny. It is no grudging 'giving in.' Consent is a spiritual transaction between one person and another, in which one makes a proposition and the other undertakes to fulfil it.

What would it entail? Already Jesus had known what might come to pass, but, now that the time was approaching, it called for something more than either grim determination or submission. It meant utter co-operation with the Father, however illogical the method appeared.

3. Finally comes *the silence of consecration.* The dedicated life is that in which personal aspiration is a response to the purpose of God. Here is the completely dedicated life of Jesus of Nazareth. He did not undertake to fulfil the task entrusted to Him for personal satisfaction, or as a personal achievement, nor yet to secure for Himself spiritual credit. He went forth assured that the way of the Father was the only possible one.

Gautama the Buddha sought enlightenment; Confucius, gathering the fruits of ancient sages, sought wisdom; Jesus sought nothing for Himself, nothing but to be able to do the will of the Father—whatever might be the outcome.

Such a dedicated life is a saving life. The dedicated life may be a broken life, but it is the utter consecration that counts. In this case it meant accepting a cross—the acme of infamy.

This third phase, the silence of consecration, comes after the first part of *v.* 41, 'sleep on now, and take your rest.' How long is the interval between those words and the remainder of the passage, it is impossible to say. It is obviously incongruous to read, almost in the same breath, 'sleep . . . and . . . rest: it is enough, the hour is come; . . . Rise up, let us go. . . .' Hence the unmarked silence of absolute communion. Once, in the early ministry of the Lord, came a voice, 'This is my beloved son, in whom I am well pleased.' Now the sonship is complete.

As far as God could reveal Himself in a human being, there He stood, making known the unutterable self-giving of His eternal love. Manhood is ever the highest revelation of Godhood, not the starry heavens or the common bush that may be afire with God. And among men, He who is sublime is beyond doubt the inspirer and completer of our faith.

At the age of about thirty-three, with a virile robustness, an intellect above the average, and a spiritual maturity that was superb, there He stood. The agony and bloody sweat were past. He was in full possession of Himself, and it was a consecrated self—at one with the Father.

The interval of final dedication passed. Now come short, agitated sentences, tense with the inevitable, yet firm with confidence in the love of God. Here stands the Christ. Not long afterwards there followed in physical torture what had been experienced in spiritual anguish. The world's battle was won on Calvary. Heaven's battle was won in Gethsemane.

Recent Foreign Theology.

Pauline Antitheses. In a brief study, reprinted from the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique,* J. Nélis offers an examination of *The Literary Antitheses in the Epistles of St. Paul.*[1] He is not the first, of course, to note Paul's fondness for antithesis, or to study this feature of his style. In the present essay some of the ideas are illustrated from the Hellenistic or Jewish background of Paul—such as life-death, light-darkness, slave-free man, Jew-Greek—while others are treated as 'Pauline'—such as flesh-spirit, folly-wisdom, weakness-strength, Adam-Christ, sin-grace, law-faith. Why

[1] J. Nélis, *Les Antithèses Littéraires dans les Epîtres de Saint Paul* [1948]. Casterman, Tournai and Paris.

folly-wisdom should not be set in its Jewish background, when it figures so largely in the Book of Proverbs, is not clear; and flesh-spirit is not unknown in the Old Testament (cf. Is 31^3), though not developed as Paul develops it. In his closing paragraphs the author notes that the antitheses occur with varying frequency in the Epistles, and suggests that their study is relevant to the question of the authenticity of the letters. He observes that they are found only sporadically in the Pastoral Epistles.

The Apocalypse. In the Regensburger Catholic Commentary on the New Testament A. Wikenhauser has issued a translation of *The Apocalypse of John*,[1] with notes. It contains a brief Introduction, a translation of the text divided into sections, with the commentary following each section, and brief special notes on particular questions interspersed through the book. The Introduction places the book in the setting of Jewish apocalypses of the inter-testamental period while claiming that the Apocalypse is specifically and entirely a Christian work, discusses the authorship and date of the book, its meaning and its canonicity. On questions of scholarship the author takes a balanced view, without striking any specially new ground. He states the pros and cons on the question of authorship by the Apostle, but reserves fuller discussion for his Commentary on the Fourth Gospel. The brief excursus on the 1260 days links them with the various time indications of the Book of Daniel, and thus with a period of three and a half years in the reign of Antiochus IV, now carried forward into the future. On the number of the Beast he thinks the connexion with Nero is the most probable of any yet suggested. By the use of small type a great deal is packed into the brief compass of this Commentary, which not alone bears the *imprimatur* of the ecclesiastical authority, but also of the military government.

Belgian Biblical Studies. Three further studies in the series 'Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia' have recently appeared.[2] The first is by L. Cerfaux, and deals with *Brotherly Love and the Return of Christ according to Jo. 13^{33-38}*.[3] Here the author argues against the common view that the verses lack unity, and after studying brotherly love in relation to the love of God in New Testament teaching, and its place in the preparation for the Return of Christ, concludes that there is a deep unity in the verses, which reflect the genuine teaching of our Lord.

The second study is by H. van den Bussche, and it deals with *The Text of Nathan's Prophecy on the Davidic Dynasty*.[4] This offers a careful and detailed study of the text of the prophecy in 2 S 7, compared with that which stands in 1 Ch 17, with attention also to the text of Ps 89. The author is acquainted with much relevant modern literature, but shows independence of judgment, and argues that we have not the simple dependence of the Chronicler on 2 Samuel, but the dependence of both texts on an older form of the Samuel text. In language and style the text of Chronicles is in some respects nearer to the original, and even in theological ideas, as evidenced in the use of the Divine names and the messianic content of the passage, the Chronicler is closer to the original.

The third issue is rather a collection of studies in the series *Biblical Miscellanea*,[5] by J. Coppens, of which earlier issues have been noted in these columns. In the present collection there are six essays, of which five are of the nature of appendices to the author's recent work on the Sin of Paradise.[6] These deal with M. Guitton's views on the Sin of Paradise, of which M. Coppens was ignorant when he published his work, but which has points of similarity to his view; patristic passages offering a sexual interpretation of the sin of Adam and Eve; the Serpent goddess of Sinai, according to Professor Albright's recent decipherment of the proto-Sinaitic inscriptions; a defence of the author's interpretation of Gn 3^{22} against criticism to which it has been subjected; and a study of the interpretation of that text in Philo and the Targums. The remaining study is a long and detailed review of Professor Vriezen's *Introduction to the Old Testament*.[7] All of the studies are marked by the well-known learning and acuteness of Professor Coppens.

The Wisdom of Seneca. A study of *The Wisdom of Seneca* from the pen of A. de Bovis has appeared as No. 13 in the series *Théologie* of the Theological Faculty of Lyon-Fourvière.[8] In it the author examines the teachings of the tutor of Nero in the background of Stoic philosophy, and shows that the high ethical level of his principles is linked

[1] A. Wikenhauser, *Offenbarung des Johannes übersetzt und erklärt* [1947]. Gregorius Verlag (formerly Fr. Pustet), Regensburg.

[2] Series II, Nos. 6, 7 and 8. Duculot, Gembloux, and Desclée de Brouwer, Bruges and Paris.

[3] *La charité fraternelle et le retour du Christ selon Jo. 13^{33-38}* [1948].

[4] *Le texte de la prophétie de Nathan sur la Dynastie Davidique* [1948].

[5] *Miscellanées Bibliques* xviii–xxiii [1948].

[6] *La connaissance du Bien et du Mal et le péché du Paradis* (Analecta Lovaniensia Biblica et Orientalia, II, 3) [1948].

[7] *Oud-israëlietische Geschriften* [1948].

[8] André de Bovis, *La sagesse de Sénèque* [1948]. Aubier, Paris.

with a monism which is closely related to pantheism, but a monism which breaks down under the pressure of concrete reality. Within his thought there is a certain polarity combining an intimacy between man and the all-embracing Deity with a coldness and distance between them, while the loftiness of his ethic of living according to Nature is combined with a sense of the futility of all things that closely resembles the pessimistic strain in the teaching of Ecclesiastes. The book rests on a thorough study of the works of Seneca, and is well documented with references and quotations.

Zwingli and Church Discipline. Appropriately enough, from the Zwingli Publishing House in Zürich comes a study of the Swiss Reformer's somewhat variable ideas on discipline, under the title *Church Discipline according to Zwingli*, written by Roger Ley.[1] Here the author seeks to relate to their causes the varying positions on this question adopted by Zwingli at different points of his career. His work is thus a historical study of some importance, and in so far as it brings out the principles on which ecclesiastical discipline should, or should not, rest, it is a contribution to present-day discussions. The author cites in his opening paragraph a remark of Schian's to the effect that a clear statement of the foundation and limits of ecclesiastical discipline from the Evangelical standpoint is wanting, and by the study of Zwingli's positions he seeks to throw some light on this question.

His book is divided into two sections, of which the second and shorter consists of three appendices on the questions of the subject of ecclesiastical discipline and of exclusion from the Communion service, and the various forms of ecclesiastical punishment in Zürich. The first and main section of the book examines the positions taken up by Zwingli before 1526, and from 1527 to 1531, and particularly in relation to the matter of exclusion from the Sacrament, and in the light of his controversial encounters.

Zinzendorf. From the Uppsala School of Hjalmar Lindroth comes a valuable study of *Zinzendorf's Idea of Religion*, written by Gösta Hök.[2] Here we have a careful study of the teaching of the founder of the Moravians as to (*a*) the nature of religion, and (*b*) the nature of Christianity. The author opens his work by citing an observation of Schleiermacher's, in which he described himself as 'a Moravian of a higher order,' and the book is designed to bring out the relation between the ideas of Zinzendorf and those of the nineteenth-century theology and philosophy of religion, which the writer believes to be not accidental though not always correctly understood. The work rests on a thorough knowledge of original sources, and there are frequent citations from the writings of Zinzendorf. Of critical studies written in German and in the Scandinavian languages he shows knowledge, but scant acquaintance with works written in English.

In the first part of the book the author studies Zinzendorf's idea of faith and its relation to love, the meaning of the new birth and the Sacraments, and the essence of religion as belonging to the heart and the emotions. In the second part he studies the *ordo salutis*, the passivity of Moravianism, and the threefold development of religion that reaches its climax in Christian perfection. Throughout, the work is objective and not polemical, and it will have lasting value.

Religious Education. A small booklet dealing with the *Stages and Methods of Christian Instruction* has been written by H. J. Rinderknecht.[3] The publishers describe this as 'an iron ration for the religious instructor.' It offers in a few pages a glance at child psychology and the interests that mark the various stages of growth, and the forms of religious instruction suited to them, and reaches the commonly accepted conclusion that the years of puberty are the most important years for winning allegiance for Christ. The author urges that the less systematic the teaching is at this stage, and the more closely it is linked with other natural interests, the more successful it will be. He illustrates his conclusions by diagrams, and his work is marked by a sense of the importance of seizing the fleeting opportunity that the years of puberty offer.

Problems of the Hour. A series of pamphlets on *Contemporary Church Problems*,[4] has been appearing for some time in Switzerland, of which the latest are by Dr. D. Lerch and Dr. Emil Brunner. The former is a short study of *The Problem of Toleration*,[5] which was delivered as an inaugural lecture by the author, who is a *Privatdozent* at the

[1] R. Ley, *Kirchenzucht bei Zwingli*, 'Quellen und Abhandlungen zur Geschichte des schweizerischen Protestantismus,' vol. ii. [1948]. Zwingli-Verlag, Zürich (Fr. 9.00).

[2] G. Hök, *Zinzendorfs Begriff der Religion* [1948], 'Uppsala Universitets Årsskrift' [1948] vi. Lundequistska Bokhandeln, Uppsala, and Harrassowitz, Leipzig (Kr. 10.00).

[3] H. J. Rinderknecht, *Stadien und Stilart der christlichen Unterweisung*, 'Erziehung und Schule,' xii. [1948]. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich.

[4] *Kirchliche Zeitfragen*, published by Zwingli-Verlag, Zürich.

[5] D. Lerch, *Das Problem der Toleranz in theologischer Sicht* [1948] (Heft 22).

University of Zürich. It deals with a problem which is of much wider concern than to the theologian to-day. The writer treats briefly of the scope, nature, and problem of toleration, and of the implications of the Biblical teaching and revelation. The latter consists of the address which Brunner delivered to the Amsterdam Conference on the subject of *Communism, Capitalism and Christianity*.[1] It declared that Christianity confronts both Communism and Capitalism with a decisive No! A truly Christian order of society has therefore yet to be worked out. Both subjects are too large to be dealt with adequately in a few pages, and could with advantage be worked out at greater length; but both are pressing questions on which the Church should be pondering to-day, and if they stimulate thought on them, these pamphlets will have fulfilled their mission.

H. H. Rowley.

Manchester University.

[1] E. Brunner, *Kommunismus, Kapitalismus, und Christentum* [1948] (Heft 23).

Contributions and Comments.

The Messiah in the Testament of Levi xviii.

In his discussion, in The Expository Times for December 1949, of my note (in the August [1949] number) on *The Testament of Levi* xviii. 6, Mr. Porter has offered an alternative, if less exciting, explanation of this remarkable verse.

His careful preliminary sifting of the textual evidence is particularly welcome. He is, however, prepared to accept Charles's text, so that the textual point need not detain us. If Mr. Porter errs at all here it is on the side of caution: the intrinsic merits of Charles's reading, not to mention its Greek (and not only its Armenian) attestation, speak for themselves.[1]

The point about punctuation is a fine one. Mr. Porter would omit the comma after 'sanctification' and connect the last clause closely with this word. To this I can see no objection, provided the intervening words 'with paternal voice' are given their full weight. The concluding line, in fact, follows so closely on the one preceding, that, even with a comma, it is difficult to see in what other connexion it could be taken. (In the poetic structure, the last two lines are in synthetic parallelism, the second completing the sense of the first.)

A general interpretation of the verse could not be more admirably expressed than in Mr. Porter's third paragraph: '. . . "sanctification" will come upon the Messiah from the heavenly temple by means of some utterance of his Divine Father as a similar sanctification came upon Isaac through some utterance of his father Abraham.'

The main point at issue between Mr. Porter and myself is whether to interpret the Sanctification which is to come upon the Messiah in this way in the light of the one passage in canonical Scripture where Abraham does address Isaac (Gn 22^{8}) or of some midrashic blessing of Isaac such as we find at *Jubilees* $21^{21\text{-}25}$.

I am surprised that Mr. Porter did not support his argument by citing the alternative version of *Levi* 18^{6} which is to be found at *Judah* 24, a fragment which Charles thought referred originally to the Messiah from Levi:

> *And the heavens shall be opened unto him*
> *And the blessings (v. l. blessing) of the Holy Father*
> *will be poured down upon him.*

Unhappily for Mr. Porter's theory, the reference to Isaac and Abraham has been left out by the author of the *Testaments* at this point: if he really had had in mind a blessing of Isaac by Abraham, it would have been even more appropriate here than in the earlier passage.

The existence of this alternative version convinces me that the writer had something quite different in mind at *Levi* 18^{6} from a blessing of Isaac by Abraham or of the Messiah by His Father. This he has expressed by the word *sanctification*, a term peculiarly associated with the Israelite *cultus*.

Dr. Charles is almost certainly right in taking 'sanctification' in its sense of 'consecration.' The Messiah from Levi is consecrated to his high office by this Divine utterance. Moreover, in the light of *v.* 7, such 'consecration' was evidently immanent, as well as transcendent in its origin.

> *And the glory of the Most High shall be uttered*
> *over him*
> *And the spirit of understanding and sanctification*
> *shall rest upon him.*

The Sanctification of the Son is a spiritual state imparted by the Father.

[1] Mr. Porter cites MS. *a* (as does Charles) in support of both πῆς and πατρός. Is this a slip or does it represent a genuine variation in one or both of the copies?

How are we to interpret this inward aspect of the Messiah's Sanctification ?

In *IV Maccabees* 17^{20}, the verb ἁγιάζειν is used to describe the martyred Maccabees, the aged priest Eliezer, the Hebrew mother and her seven sons, in a context and connexion of considerable interest, and, I believe, importance, not only for the interpretation of the noun at *Levi* 18^{6}, but for the understanding of New Testament usage, especially in Hebrews.

The martyred Maccabees, in verses of exalted, even poetic character, are declared to stand now before the Divine throne and to enjoy the blessed life (*v.* 18) : this is supported by Scripture, Dt 33^{3}, quoted in the LXX form, καὶ πάντες οἱ ἡγιασμένοι ὑπὸ τὰς χεῖράς σου (E.V. 'And all his saints are in thy hands'). *V.* 20 continues : καὶ οὗτοι οὖν ἁγιασθέντες διὰ θεὸν τετίμηνται ; *v.* 22 makes it clear that the language is that of the altar and its 'sacred' victims, ὥσπερ ἀντίψυχον γεγονότας τῆς τοῦ ἔθνους ἁμαρτίας καὶ διὰ τοῦ αἵματος τῶν εὐσεβῶν ἐκείνων καὶ τοῦ ἱλαστηρίου θανάτου αὐτῶν, ἡ θεία πρόνοια τὸν Ἰσραὴλ προκακωθέντα διέσωσεν. The martyrs 'were sanctified' or 'sanctified themselves,' 'for God's sake,' in their surrender of their lives in devoted θεοσέβεια (cf. *v.* 15 θεοσέβεια δε ἐνίκα). Similar language is applied to the deaths of the Maccabaean saints at *IV Maccabees* $6^{28.\ 29}$, especially the words καθάρσιον αὐτῶν ποίησον τὸ ἐμὸν αἷμα.[1]

Here in the Jewish Greek of the first century A.D. is an anticipation of a usage which has survived in rabbinical Hebrew in the phrase 'the sanctifying (or hallowing) of the Name' (*qiddush hashem*), which is practically a *terminus technicus* used to describe the sacrifice of life for religion ; the Talmud singles out as pre-eminent among those who 'sanctified' (or 'glorified') the Name the Maccabaean martyrs or the martyrs of Bar Cochba's revolt.[2]

This Jewish usage is post-Christian, but in view of the intimate connexion of the *Testaments* with the Maccabaean period and the inevitableness of such a metaphor in such times in a priestly nation, where the office of High Priest and King were united, I am prepared to detect such a meaning behind ἁγίασμα in *Levi* 18^{6}, and to suggest that the inner 'consecration' of the Messiah lay in His readiness to offer Himself as a sacrifice for His people.

So far as the general idea of vicarious suffering and death is concerned, it 'was not unfamiliar to pre-Christian Judaism and especially with regard to the martyrs under Antiochus Epiphanes.'[3] In *Reuben* 6^{12}, it is 'the seed of Levi' which is to die 'in wars visible and invisible on our behalf . . . and will be among you an eternal King' ; in *Joseph* 19, Levi is the victorious Lamb, and *Benjamin* 3^{8} contains the following fragment :

In thee shall be fulfilled the prophecy of heaven
That a blameless one shall be delivered up for lawless men
And a sinless shall die for ungodly men.

The Divine prophecy here is not improbably Is 53.

In Jewish rabbinical tradition there is a poetic presentation of the *Aqedah* (the Sacrifice of Isaac) which bears a striking similarity to *Levi* $18^{6f.}$.[4] (The translation of the Aramaic is my own.)

The heavens were bowed and brought low,
So that Isaac beheld their perfection,
And his eyes were dazzled by their heights.
(*Jerusalem Targum* ii, Gn 22^{8}.)

The eyes of Abraham were gazing into those of Isaac ;
But the eyes of Isaac were fixed on the angels on high,
Which Isaac did see, but Abraham failed to see.
Thereupon there descended a voice (bath qol) from heaven and said :
Behold the righteous twain, the only ones (yehidhin) in the world,
One sacrificing, the other being sacrificed.
(*Ib.* Lev 22^{27}.)

The antiquity of the *Aqedah* tradition is acknowledged, and it is quite possible that a pre-Christian midrash of this type (not necessarily the source of the extant midrash) was present to the mind of the author of the *Testaments*. In the Palestinian Targum the words of Abraham to Isaac at Gn 22^{8} are paraphrased poetically as follows :

And Abraham said :
The word (memra) of the Lord will provide a Lamb ('imra)
But if not, then thou art the offering, O my son.

In the light of such considerations, it seems to me that the interpretation I have suggested for *Levi* 18^{6} is reasonably well supported.

MATTHEW BLACK.

Leeds.

---

[1] For the idea (not the language), cf. II *Macc.* 7^{38}.

[2] Cf. Moore, *Judaism*, ii. 105 ff. Kittel's *Theol. Wörterbuch*, *s.v.* ἁγιάζω refers to the rabbinical expression, but does not contain the reference to *IV Maccabees* 17^{20}.

[3] Charles, *Testaments*, note on *Benjamin* 3^{8}.

[4] Cf. Louis Ginsburg, *Legends of the Jews*, i. 279 f., v. 50 f.

'Whosoever hath, to him shall be given . . .'

I WONDER if anyone has noticed a superficial resemblance to this saying of Christ in an epigram of Martial (5. 81):

Semper pauper eris, si pauper es, Aemiliane.
Dantur opes nullis nunc nisi divitibus.

(If you are poor, you will always be poor, Aemilianus. Wealth nowadays is given to none but the rich.)

G. M. LE

Bedford.

Mark viii. 33: A Mistranslation from the Aramaic?

'WHAT is needed to substantiate the theory of an Aramaic original for Mark,' wrote the late Professor Burney,[1] 'is some cogent evidence of mistranslation.' We believe that this evidence is available in the well-known saying, 'Get thee behind me, Satan.' It is the contention of the writer that an underlying Aramaic statement has been misunderstood and therefore mistranslated into Greek.

At first sight the word Σατανᾶς might appear to be a transliteration of the Hebrew שָׂטָן, or to be dependent upon the LXX. When we turn to the LXX however we find that שָׂטָן is usually translated as διαβολός[2] and very occasionally transliterated as Σατάν.[3] It is not until the end of the second century B.C. when Ecclesiasticus is being rendered into Greek that we find the form Σαταναῦς.[4] By this time we know that Aramaic was making itself felt in the Greek translation of the Scriptures.[5] And if Aramaic could influence the words cited by Swete and Thackeray it is at least possible that it could influence the word Σατανᾶς. In Mark it is this Aramaic form which is universally found.[6] It occurs also in the *Paris Magical Papyrus* of C. A.D. 300 as σαδανᾶς.[7] Deissmann draws attention to the Semitic influence behind this papyrus.[8]

It seems likely therefore that this word goes back to an Aramaic rather than a Hebrew original. If this is so, then it is not unreasonable to ask whether or not the remainder of the words are likewise dependent upon the Aramaic. And while considering the words in Mark we should take with them the same saying as it is preserved for us in Q (Mt 4^{10}). It is the Sinaitic Syriac version of Matthew which throws light on the saying. The rendering there is, ܙܠ ܒܬܪܟ ܣܛܢܐ, *i.e.*, 'Get thee behind thee.' This is a frequent Syriac idiom found elsewhere in the New Testament[9] which means 'to retire or withdraw.'[10]

We should read therefore ὀπίσω σοῦ both in Mark and Q. In the Q passage it may be observed that D preserves an inaccurate recollection of the right reading with his ὀπίσω μοῦ. Westcott and Hort omit it in their deference to B. It should probably be restored as ὀπίσω σοῦ, in line with the early reading of the Sinaitic Syriac.

Lagrange affirms[11] ὕπαγε *est en effet du style de Mt. surtout à l'impératif, mais c'est une tournure sémitique qui convient parfaitement à la source araméenne.* There is now an added reason for believing in an Aramaic source.

FREDERICK BUSSBY.

Bournemouth.

The Translation of the New Testament.

PROFESSOR HUNTER has reviewed four modern translations of the New Testament, and summarized the procedure to be adopted by the scholars engaged in producing a new translation of the Bible. 'Sometimes,' he says, '. . . the translators will hit the mark, and achieve in English the precise *nuance* of the Greek phrase.'

In his *Letters to Young Churches*, J. B. Phillips when translating (or sometimes paraphrasing) the New Testament Epistles often gives a rendering more illuminating than the four modern translations recently reviewed. One or two examples will illustrate this point.

Eph 4^{26}. The Revised Standard Version reads, 'do not let the sun go down on your anger.'

[1] *The Aramaic Origin of the Fourth Gospel*, 19.

[2] 1 Ch 21^{1}, Job 1^{6}, and throughout the book, Ps 108 (109)[6] and throughout Zechariah.

[3] 1 K $11^{14.\ 23}$.

[4] Ec 21^{27}.

[5] Swete, *Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*, 319. n. 3. Thackeray, *Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek*, 28; cf. Edgar, 'The Phœnician Influence on the Fayyum Papyri of the 3rd Cent. B.C.,' in *The Bulletin of the John Rylands Library*, xviii. 112.

[6] Mk 1^{13} $3^{23.\ 26}$ 4^{15} 8^{33}.

[7] Milligan, *Greek Papyri*, 113.

[8] *Light from the Ancient East*, 250.

[9] Mt 24^{18}, Mk 13^{16} (Sinaitic Syriac).

[10] Torrey, *The Four Gospels*, 294; Merx, *Die vier kanonischen Evangelien*, Pt. II. last half p. 54-56. I owe this reference to Professor T. W. Manson.

[11] *Evangile selon S. Matthieu*, 62.

Weymouth renders, 'let not your irritation last until the sun goes down.' Moffatt does not help by translating 'never let the sun set upon your exasperation.' Phillips says pointedly, 'never go to bed angry.'

Or Ro 12^{16}:

'Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low estate. Be not wise in your own conceits.'—A.V.

'Do not be haughty, but associate with the lowly; never be conceited.'—Revised Standard Version.

'Instead of being ambitious, associate with humble folk; *never be self-conceited.*'—Moffatt.

'Do not let your thoughts be high-flown, but accommodate yourself to humble ways. Do not be self-opinionated.'—Weymouth.

'Don't become snobbish but take a real interest in ordinary people. Don't become set in your own opinions.'—Phillips.

Or Col 3^{21}:

'Fathers, do not provoke your children, lest they become discouraged.'—Revised Standard Version.

'Fathers, avoid irritating your children, in case they get dispirited.'—Moffatt.

'Fathers, do not fret and harass your children, or you will make them sullen and morose.'—Weymouth.

'Fathers, don't over-correct your children, or they will grow up feeling inferior and frustrated.'—Phillips.

The last quoted translations may not meet the exacting requirements of those engaged on the new official translation but they do help to put the 'lively oracles of God into the speech of our time.'

R. Gledhill.

Norton Rectory, Sheffield.

Psalm lviii. 9.

There is considerable uncertainty about the metaphor used here in the minds of commentators, who conjecture an interpretation from the use of the pots for cooking. To one who has watched the making, and the firing, of earthenware pots by native tribes in Nyasaland, however, the metaphor is perfectly clear.

The making of pottery among the Tumbuka and Tonga tribes in Nyasaland (and doubtless elsewhere) is in the hands of the women. A quantity of suitable clay is dug from a clay-pit, and carried to the village. There it is moistened and worked by hand till it has the proper consistence, and all pebbles, grit, and twigs, etc., have been removed. The pots are then moulded by hand according to the shape and size required, and set out to dry in the sun. They are then said to be 'green,' and cannot be used till they have been fired, as the sun-dried clay cannot withstand moisture. (Similarly, sun-dried bricks are called 'green' bricks in contrast to 'burnt' bricks.)

The firing of the pots is done in the evening, when there is a gentle breeze to fan the fire, at a convenient spot in the bush near the village. The batch of pots is assembled, and a supply of fuel got ready in the shape of twigs and branches of a *thorn* bush, which blaze up readily, and cause an intense heat: the skill of the operator is shown by the even application of the heat so as to ensure its uniform action and secure the full firing of the whole without leaving any parts not properly fired which would give way with the action of water in use—at the same time the fire must be evenly applied to prevent cracking by over-heating at one point.

The strong heat causes an increase of the wind, and sometimes a whirlwind comes along and scatters the whole set-up, with the result that all the labour is lost, whether of 'green' pots just 'feeling the thorns,' or those in process of 'being burnt.'

In this sense the metaphor is in line with that in the previous verse (*v.* 8), meaning the destruction of something valuable in the process of formation, before the process has been brought to completion.

William Y. Turner.

Lately, Secretary,
The Livingstonia Mission.

St. Mark xiv. 72: ἐπιβαλὼν ἔκλαιεν.

That these much disputed words should be translated 'he began to weep' or 'he set to and wept' seems to be strongly supported by Diogenes Laertius, vi. 27, ἐπέβαλε τερετίζειν ('he started whistling'). The use of the participle by Mark may perhaps be a colloquialism.

G. M. Lee.

Bedford.

Printed in Scotland by Morrison & Gibb Limited, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. Clark, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to The Editor, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.